2007

RESOURCE CARDS
ON CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

EdSource®
Clarifying Complex Education Issues™

Table of Contents

Finance Data — Card

Categorical Aid 1
Categorical Programs: State 2
Categorical Programs/NCLB: Federal 3
Facilities 4
Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds 5
Local Elections: Parcel Taxes 6
Rankings for California 7
Total Revenues for Education 8

Finance and General Background — Card

Finance Background:

Budget Calendar 9
Proposition 13 and Gann Limit 10
Proposition 98 11
Revenue Limits for School Districts 12
Revenues for School Districts (Other Sources) 13
School Finance Chronology 14

General Background:

Charter Schools 15
Class Size Reduction 16
Data Collection and Reporting 17
Governance of Public Schools 18
Instructional Materials 19
Special Education 20

Performance/Students — Card

Performance:

Academic Performance Index (API) 21
High School Exit Exam 22
High School Graduation 23
No Child Left Behind (NCLB) 24
Program Improvement/Interventions 25
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program 26
STAR Data 27

Students:

English Learners 28
Enrollments 29
Student Demographics 30

Staffing/Higher Education — Card

Staffing:

Administrators in California 31
Collective Bargaining 32
Teacher Credential Requirements 33
Teacher Demographics 34

Higher Education:

College Eligibility 35
College Enrollments 36
Community Colleges 37

Index

These cards give you fingertip access to the latest information about California's education system. They are separated into sections that cover related topics. Each section card includes references to more in-depth information found in EdSource full-length reports and shorter publications. (The shorter publications can generally be downloaded for free from our website.) You may order additional copies of these *2007 Resource Cards* for $8 each. Generous bulk discounts are also available. For ordering information, please contact the EdSource office at 650/917-9481 or go to our website: **www.edsource.org**

*This publication is made possible thanks to the support of the **Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation** and the **Noyce Foundation**.*

© 2007 by EdSource, Inc. All rights reserved. Revised March 2007.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Finance Data

TOPIC	CARD
Categorical Aid	1
Categorical Programs: State	2
Categorical Programs/NCLB: Federal	3
Facilities	4
Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds	5
Local Elections: Parcel Taxes	6
Rankings for California	7
Total Revenues for Education	8

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

Rethinking How California Funds Its Schools (5/04)

School Finance 2006–07 (10/06)

* *School Finance Highlights 2006–07* (10/06)

Trends and Comparisons in California School Finance (1/07)

Understanding School Finance (1/00)

* *How California's Education Dollars Are Spent* (10/01)

EdSource®
Clarifying Complex Education Issues™

For data about every school and district in California, see the Education Data Partnership (Ed-Data) website: **www.ed-data.k12.ca.us**

For a comprehensive view of California's school finance system, see**: www.californiaschoolfinance.org**

** Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.*

Definition

Categorical aid is money from the state and federal government targeted to particular programs, such as K–3 Class Size Reduction, and to students with special needs, such as Special Education.

Funding

About one-third of total K–12 education funding comes from more than 85 state and federal categorical programs. (See cards 2 and 3 for a list of those programs.) The money is granted according to formulas, incentives, and reimbursements, often tied to districts' student demographics. Some programs require a local match, and some are competitively awarded. With differing student populations and abilities to compete for funds, districts vary substantially in the amount and percentage of categorical funding they receive.

"Con App"

The state allows districts to apply for about two dozen state and federal categorical programs with a consolidated application or "con app." Most, if not all, districts use the con app to secure funding from at least some programs on the application. Programs on the con app tend to be on roughly the same timeline and include site-based programs, such as the federal Title I and the state Economic Impact Aid programs.

Local Obligations and Flexibility

In 2001 Senate Bill 374 (O'Connell) increased the number of programs on the con app and streamlined districts' planning requirements into a "Single Plan for Student Achievement." Through the Categorical Program Monitoring (CPM) process, the California Department of Education (CDE) monitors the compliance of school districts and county offices of education (COEs) with state and federal categorical program requirements, including fiscal. This process takes into account academic performance and status of compliance with state and federal law. CDE monitoring is conducted every year for one quarter of all districts and COEs in California.

Assembly Bill (AB) 825 (Firebaugh), passed in 2004, consolidated 26 categorical programs into six block grants: Pupil Retention, School Safety, Teacher Credentialing, Professional Development, Targeted Instructional Improvement, and School and Library Improvement. Each block grant may be spent for any of the purposes authorized in the programs that were consolidated, though some additional conditions apply. In 2006–07 the affected programs represented about 12% of the state's total annual categorical spending.

AB 825 authorizes districts to transfer up to 15% of funds from four of the block grants to any other categorical program for which a district is eligible. (No transfers from Pupil Retention or Teacher Credentialing block grants are allowed.) Districts are able to use these transferred funds to increase spending in any categorical program by up to 20%, thus allowing districts the flexibility to adjust program funding locally. Prior to transferring funds, a district or county office must discuss doing so at a public meeting.

Sunset

Categorical programs typically have "sunset" or expiration clauses to encourage legislators to periodically review them. However, some categorical programs are created because of forces outside the Legislature, such as court orders or decisions. Funding for those programs continues even if legislators allow the pertinent laws and regulations to sunset.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

STATE CATEGORICAL PROGRAM FUNDING, 2006–07

(As approved in the 2006–07 state budget adopted in July 2006.)

	Millions
Special Education	$3,066
Class Size Reduction (K–3)	1,763
Child Care and Development (includes preschool)	1,389
Targeted Instructional Improvement Block Grant* (includes Targeted Instructional Improvement Grants and Supplemental Grants)	1,034
Economic Impact Aid	973
Adult Education (includes $16.4 million for students in correctional facilities)	703
Pupil Transportation	602
Regional Occupational Centers and Programs	458
Library Improvement Block Grant* (includes library materials and School Improvement Programs)	447
Instructional Materials	404
Summer School/Supplemental Instruction	376
Deferred Maintenance	270
Professional Development Block Grant* (includes Instructional Time and Staff Development, Intersegmental Programs, and Teaching as a Priority)	264
High Priority Schools Grant Program	249
High School Counseling (7th–12th)	200
Pupil Retention Block Grant* (includes Supplemental Instruction, 10th Grade Counseling, Dropout Prevention Programs, etc.)	120
Child Nutrition	106
Arts and Music Block Grant	105
Teacher Credentialing Block Grant* (includes BTSA)	103
Class Size Reduction, Grade 9	102
Charter School Categorical Programs	101

	Millions
School Safety Block Grant	$97
Year-round Education Grant Program	94
Student Assessment	89
California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) Intensive Instruction and Services	70
English Learners (ELs)	61
Math and Reading Professional Development	57
Cal-SAFE (California School Age Families Education)	56
Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)	53
Community Day Schools	50
Teacher Retention and Recruitment	48
Instructional Support (includes Bilingual Teacher Training Assistance Program, Teacher Peer Review Program, and Reader Services for Blind Teachers)	31
Partnership Academies	24
Tobacco Use Prevention Education	22
Foster Youth Services	18
Education Technology	17
School Safety Consolidated Competitive Grant* (includes school safety grants, School Community Policing Partnership Act, School Community Violence Prevention, etc.)	17
FCMAT (Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team) (includes CSIS Project oversight)	16
CSIS (California School Information Services)	15
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification Incentive	13
Apprenticeship Program	12
Early Mental Health	10
County Office of Education *Williams* Settlement Audits	10

Note: Additional programs are funded for less than $10 million.
* Part of the new Categorical Education Block Grant (Assembly Bill 825)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Categorical Programs/NCLB: Federal

Federal categorical funding makes up about 11% of California's total K–12 education funding in 2006–07. Much of it comes from programs created by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The 2001 ESEA reauthorization—which became law in 2002—is called the "No Child Left Behind" Act (NCLB). It modifies the original ESEA, as have previous reauthorizations. NCLB increases the federal focus on educationally disadvantaged pupils, including English learners and students who live in poverty. The law also emphasizes a standards-based reform agenda including: high academic standards for all students; extra support to help students and schools meet those standards; and greater accountability for the results, particularly as measured by student performance on standardized tests. NCLB also provides funds to prepare, train, recruit, and retain high quality teachers; support innovative programs, such as charter schools; and create before- and after-school programs.

FEDERAL CATEGORICAL PROGRAM FUNDING, 2006–07

NCLB Programs

	Millions
ESEA Title I – Extra Support for Students who Live in Poverty	**$2,079**
Basic Grants	1,680
Reading First	159
Migrant Education	154
School Improvement	72
Homeless Children Education	8
Advanced Placement Fee Waiver	3
Neglected and Delinquent Children	3
ESEA Title II – Improving Teacher and Administrator Quality	**382**
Improving Teacher Quality (referred to as Part A)	316
Education Technology	34
Math and Science Partnership Grants	26
Subject Matter Projects	4
Principal Training Program	2
ESEA Title III – English Learners and Immigrant Students	**148**
ESEA Title IV – 21st Century Schools	**197**
After-school Programs	163
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities	34

	Millions
ESEA Title V – Innovative Programs	**$27**
Comprehensive School Reform Program	16
Innovative Programs	11
ESEA Title VI – Assessment Funding	**33**

Other Federal Programs

Child Nutrition	$1,627
Special Education	1,151
Child Care and Development Programs (includes CalWORKs)	963
Vocational Education	141
Adult Education	79
Charter Schools	30

Note: Additional programs are funded for less than $10 million.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Major Sources of Facility Funds

State bonds In the past 10 years, voters have approved four large state bonds for new construction and modernization of K–12 schools: $6.7 billion (1998), $11.4 billion (2002), $10 billion (2004), and $7.3 billion (2006). Local districts generally must provide matching funds.

Local general obligation (G.O.) bonds School districts may issue school construction bonds and levy property taxes to pay for them with voter approval. Since 2001 districts have had the choice of whether to seek two-thirds approval or 55% approval (with added accountability provisions). Prior to 2001, districts needed two-thirds approval. (See cards 5 and 13.)

From 2001 through 2006, 393 districts sought 55% voter approval, and 326 (83%) of those elections succeeded. From 1986 through 2006, 931 districts sought two-thirds voter approval, and 512 (55%) were successful. Altogether, 1,324 G.O. bond elections were held in that time period, and 838 (63%) passed. Local bond elections generated a total of $36.1 billion between 1998 and 2006.

Facility districts Since 1998 school districts have been able to establish a School Facility Improvement District (SFID), which taxes just a portion of the district. Before July 2001, two-thirds voter approval was required. Since July 2001 districts have been able to seek either two-thirds or 55% approval with added accountability provisions. (See Card 13.)

From 1998 through 2006, 29 SFID elections were held. Of the 15 under the two-thirds requirement, three (20%) passed. Of the 14 under the 55% requirement, 13 (93%) passed.

Developer fees School districts have the authority to levy developer fees on new construction or reconstruction. The money may be used only for facilities, including portable classrooms. The State Allocation Board adjusts the fees for inflation in even-numbered years. For 2006 and 2007 the maximum was set at 42 cents per square foot on commercial construction and $2.63 on residential construction.

Projected Need

Enrollment growth In 2005 K–12 enrollment statewide dropped slightly, the first decline since 1980. (See Card 29.) Enrollment is expected to continue to register small annual declines, returning to 2005 levels by 2013. Some school districts, however, are continuing to grow.

New classrooms and modernization The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) projects that from 2006–07 to 2011–12, the state will need to build 18,000 new classrooms and modernize more than 61,000 classrooms that are more than 25 years old. Together the new and remodeled classrooms would serve almost 2.1 million K–12 students. OPSC bases its estimates on 25 students per K–6 classroom and 27 students per 7–12 classroom.

Multitrack, year-round schools Some schools operate on a multitrack, year-round calendar in order to maximize facility capacity, but the number of schools on this calendar has been declining.

MULTITRACK, YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Year	No. of Schools	Enrollment
2005–06	690	700,141
2004–05	751	804,189
2003–04	809	884,250

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

See: EdSource voter guides: *Proposition 47* (9/02), *Proposition 55* (1/04), and *Proposition 1D* (9/06)

Data: CDE
California Department of Finance (DOF)
Office of Public School Construction (OPSC)
School Services of California, Inc.
State Allocation Board (SAB)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds

Look below for successful 2006 bond measures, based on the best available information. To see each district's election history, go to: **www.ed-data.k12.ca.us**

55% VOTE

District	Amount	Date	Yes Vote
Alisal Union Elementary	$90,000,000	11/06	64.83%
Arcadia Unified	$218,000,000	11/06	66.94%
Bakersfield City Elementary	$100,000,000	11/06	63.83%
Baldwin Park Unified	$75,500,000	11/06	72.06%
Banning Unified	$63,000,000	11/06	57.96%
Bass Lake Joint Elementary	$1,500,000	6/06	62.36%
Bassett Unified	$20,000,000	11/06	73.37%
Beardsley Elementary	$10,300,000	6/06	60.45%
Black Oak Mine Unified	$6,900,000	11/06	62.45%
Buckeye Union Elementary	$28,300,000	11/06	62.43%
Byron Union Elementary	$19,700,000	6/06	58.44%
Calaveras Unified	$13,500,000	11/06	55.78%
Campbell Union High	$90,000,000	11/06	58.20%
Carlsbad Unified	$198,000,000	11/06	69.08%
Cayucos Elementary	$2,900,000	11/06	64.67%
Chatom Union Elementary	$5,000,000	11/06	61.27%
Corona-Norco Unified	$250,000,000	11/06	61.69%
Covina-Valley Unified	$66,000,000	6/06	69.00%
Dinuba Unified	$37,000,000	11/06	67.06%
Evergreen Elementary	$150,000,000	11/06	72.82%
Exeter Union High	$5,100,000	11/06	63.24%
Fontana Unified	$275,000,000	6/06	65.57%
Fortuna Union Elementary	$3,900,000	11/06	73.85%
Franklin Elementary	$2,000,000	6/06	62.43%
Fruitvale Elementary	$29,800,000	6/06	56.29%
Golden Valley Unified	$70,000,000	6/06	58.20%
Grant Joint Union High	$230,000,000	6/06	62.42%
Greenfield Union Elementary	$40,000,000	11/06	69.91%
Hemet Unified	$149,000,000	11/06	58.23%
Jefferson Union High	$136,900,000	11/06	70.20%
Kings Canyon Joint Unified	$32,000,000	11/06	60.54%
Kings River Union Elementary	$800,000	6/06	56.40%
Kingsburg Joint Union High	$32,000,000	6/06	58.95%
La Honda-Pescadero Unified	$15,000,000	11/06	70.10%
Las Virgenes Unified	$128,000,000	6/06	63.86%
Los Olivos Elementary	$4,600,000	11/06	61.47%
Madera Unified	$32,500,000	11/06	60.60%
Marysville Joint Unified	$37,000,000	6/06	57.32%
Mendocino Unified	$15,500,000	11/06	70.92%
Menlo Park City Elementary	$91,100,000	6/06	70.58%
Middletown Unified	$15,300,000	11/06	66.90%
Monrovia Unified	$45,000,000	6/06	67.11%
Murrieta Valley Unified	$120,000,000	6/06	57.37%
Napa Valley Unified	$183,000,000	11/06	60.71%
Natomas Unified	$145,500,000	6/06	62.00%
North County Joint Union Elementary	$3,300,000	6/06	55.18%
North Sacramento Elementary	$17,500,000	6/06	69.29%
Nuview Union Elementary	$39,600,000	6/06	56.20%
Oak Park Unified	$17,500,000	6/06	60.09%
Oakland Unified	$435,000,000	6/06	77.97%
Ocean View Elementary	$13,200,000	11/06	72.06%
Oxnard Elementary	$64,000,000	11/06	64.46%
Pacific Grove Unified	$42,000,000	6/06	65.60%
Paramount Unified	$100,000,000	11/06	74.14%
Paso Robles Joint Unified	$20,000,000	11/06	60.38%
Perris Elementary	$25,000,000	11/06	68.67%
Pittsburg Unified	$85,000,000	11/06	74.12%
Rio Linda Union Elementary	$38,000,000	11/06	62.13%
Rowland Unified	$118,000,000	6/06	70.53%
San Francisco Unified	$450,000,000	11/06	73.85%
San Jacinto Unified	$150,000,000	11/06	67.01%
San Leandro Unified	$109,000,000	11/06	68.66%
San Mateo Union High	$298,000,000	11/06	66.50%
Sanger Unified	$30,800,000	6/06	64.70%
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified	$268,000,000	11/06	67.51%
Santa Rita Union Elementary	$14,600,000	11/06	57.83%
Santee Elementary	$60,000,000	11/06	58.51%
Selma Unified	$23,800,000	11/06	70.09%
Sierra Sands Unified	$50,500,000	6/06	61.19%
Solvang Elementary	$11,600,000	6/06	61.62%
Standard Elementary	$28,000,000	6/06	64.87%
Sweetwater Union High	$644,000,000	11/06	67.47%
Sylvan Union Elementary	$40,000,000	11/06	56.89%
Tamalpais Union High	$79,900,000	6/06	66.88%
Tracy Joint Unified	$51,000,000	6/06	68.71%
Weaver Union Elementary	$16,500,000	6/06	62.71%

TWO-THIRDS VOTE*

District	Amount	Date	Yes Vote
Ross Elementary	$15,000,000	6/06	78.90%

* See Card 4 for an explanation of the difference between measures that require 55% and two-thirds voter approval.

Data: EdSource
School Services of California, Inc.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Local Elections: Parcel Taxes (Two-thirds Vote)

Card 6

Successful parcel tax elections in 2005 and 2006, based on the best available information, are listed below.

District	Date	Yes Vote
Acalanes Union HSD $189/parcel-6 yrs; Curricula, programs	3/05	**75.02%**
Alameda City USD $189/parcel-7 yrs; Teachers, small classes, programs	6/05	**67.20%**
Albany City USD $250/parcel/5¢ sq. ft.-7 yrs; Staff, small classes, programs	11/05	**68.53%**
Berkeley USD 22.8¢ sq. ft. res., 34.4¢ sq. ft. nonres., $50 unimproved parcel-10 yrs	11/06	**79.68%**
Brisbane ESD $96/parcel-6 yrs; Teachers, class size, instructional materials	3/05	**69.85%**
Harmony Union ESD $52/parcel-8 yrs; Library, teachers, instructional support	6/05	**68.70%**
La Honda-Pescadero USD $100/parcel-7 yrs; Student achievement, teachers, library	11/05	**72.40%**
Larkspur ESD $289/parcel-6 yrs; Small classes, programs, staff	3/05	**76.08%**
***Los Altos ESD** $597/parcel-4 yrs; Staff, small classes, programs	11/06	**77.86%**
Novato USD $155/parcel-6 yrs; Small classes, teachers, library	3/05	**75.08%**
***Oak Grove ESD** $68/parcel-4 yrs; Remedial services, facilities, library, counseling	6/06	**65.99%**
Palo Alto USD $493/parcel-6 yrs; Small classes, programs	6/05	**74.12%**

District	Date	Yes Vote
Piedmont City USD $212–$710/unit, dwelling, or parcel-4 yrs; Programs	6/05	**83.13%**
Piedmont City USD $579 –$1,937/unit, dwelling, or parcel-4 yrs; Programs, small classes	6/05	**88.10%**
Ross Valley ESD $244.70/parcel–8 yrs; Programs	3/05	**82.99%**
Santa Cruz City ESD $70/parcel-7 yrs; Teachers, counselors, librarians	11/05	**80.10%**
Santa Cruz City HSD $28/parcel-7 yrs; Teachers, counselors, librarians	11/05	**76.90%**
Sebastopol Union ESD $52/parcel-8 yrs; Programs, counseling	3/05	**69.10%**
Shoreline USD $151.82/parcel-6 yrs; Textbooks, technology, programs	11/06	**81.13%**
Tahoe-Truckee USD $98/parcel-7 yrs; Supplies, small classes, programs	3/05	**73.34%**
Walnut Creek ESD $82/parcel-6 yrs; Teachers, small classes, libraries	3/05	**71.16%**
West Sonoma County Union HSD $26/parcel-8 yrs; Small classes, programs, school safety	6/05	**67.20%**

* This is a continuation of a Gann Appropriation Limit increase and only requires a majority approval.

Data: EdSource
School Services of California, Inc.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Rankings for California 2004–05

	California Rank in U.S.	California Average	U.S. Average	Top	Bottom
Teachers' salaries (2004–05)	2	$57,876	$47,674	$58,456/District of Columbia	$34,040/South Dakota
Expenditures per pupil (2004–05)	29	$7,942	$8,661	$15,073/District of Columbia	$5,032/Utah
Public school revenue (2002–03) per $1,000 personal income in 2003	18	$49	$48	$60/Vermont	$32/District of Columbia
Per capita personal income (2003)	13	$33,389	$31,487	$48,280/District of Columbia	$23,126/Mississippi

Note: The numbers in this table are based on fall enrollment data. The District of Columbia is included among the states.
Data: National Education Association's *Rankings & Estimates, 2005–06*

Ratio of Staff to 1,000 Pupils by Position, Fall 2004–05	California Rank in U.S.	California Average	U.S. Average	% of U.S. Average
Total school staff to students	**49**	**90.9**	**124.6***	**73%**
Professional (certified) staff to students	49	51.8	70.2*	74%
District officials/administrators	47	0.4	1.3	31%
School principals & asst. principals	49	2.2	3.4	65%
Teachers	49	48.4+	63.6+	76%
Guidance counselors	51	1.0	2.1*	48%
Librarians	51	0.2	1.1	18%

Note: The numbers in this table are based on fall enrollment data. The District of Columbia is included among the states.
* The U.S. average is slightly off due to incorrect guidance counselor data for Rhode Island.
+ These numbers translate into a student/teacher ratio of 21.1 students to 1 teacher for California and 15.8 to 1 for the U.S. average. Only Utah and Arizona have a higher student/teacher ratio than California.
Data: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data, 2004–05

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

TOTAL REVENUES FOR K–12 EDUCATION

	2005–06		2006–07 Estimates from 2006–07 Budget	
	(BILLIONS)		(BILLIONS)	
State Aid	$38.0	59.2%	$40.9	61.0%
Property Tax	13.9	21.7%	13.9	20.7%
Federal Aid	7.5	11.7%	7.4	11.0%
Local Miscellaneous	3.9	6.1%	3.9	5.8%
Lottery	1.0	1.6%	1.0	1.5%
Total	**$64.2**		**$67.1**	

Note: Due to rounding, in 2005–06 the percentages do not add up to 100% and the dollar amounts do not add up to the total for that year.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Proposition 98 guarantees a certain level of state tax and property tax funding for K–12 education and community colleges each year. (See Card 11.)

Sources of Revenue

State Aid: comes mostly from California sales and income taxes, including about $3.8 billion in 2006–07 not counted toward the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Property Tax: is allocated to schools by the state. (Cities, counties, and other agencies also receive some local property tax revenues.) Total includes $1.9 billion not counted toward the Proposition 98 guarantee.

Federal Aid: is earmarked for special purposes, most notably No Child Left Behind, Child Nutrition, and Special Education.

Local Miscellaneous: includes community contributions, interest income, developer fees, and revenues from local parcel tax elections.

Lottery: is projected at about $153 per student (based on average daily attendance) in 2006–07, with $125 in unrestricted revenues and $28 to be used only for instructional materials.

About two-thirds of K–12 education funding is for revenue limits (see Card 12), and one-third is for categorical aid, though the proportion can vary dramatically from district to district. (See Card 1.) Districts have very limited ways to supplement their revenues. (See Card 13.)

California State Lottery

In November 1984 voters approved the California State Lottery. A minimum of 34% of total lottery receipts must be distributed to public schools, colleges, and universities. The money is to supplement, not supplant, support for education. It must be used for the instruction of students with no funds spent for acquisition of real property, construction of facilities, financing of research, or any other noninstructional purpose. The lottery has provided between 1.5% and 3.8% of K–12 education revenues since 1985–86, not exceeding 2% since 1995–96. If education's share of the lottery revenue in a given year is higher than the amount provided in 1998–99, one half of the increase is to be used only for instructional materials.

K–12 EDUCATION'S SHARE OF LOTTERY FUNDS PER ADA*

Year	Unrestricted Revenue	Instructional Materials	Total Income
2005–06	$125	$27	$152
2004–05	120	22	142
2003–04	115	17	132
2002–03	113	12	125
2001–02	120	15	135

*ADA stands for average daily attendance.

Data: School Services of California, Inc.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Finance Background

TOPIC	CARD
Budget Calendar	9
Proposition 13 and Gann Limit	10
Proposition 98	11
Revenue Limits for School Districts	12
Revenues for School Districts (Other Sources)	13
School Finance Chronology	14

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

Rethinking How California Funds Its Schools (5/04)

Understanding School District Budgets (1/05)

Understanding School Finance (1/00)

School Finance 2006–07 (10/06)

* *School Finance Highlights 2006–07* (10/06)

A Glossary of School Finance Terms (8/04)

* *Building Political Will To Overhaul California's School Finance System* (4/04)

Trends and Comparisons in California School Finance (1/07)

* *Q&A: The Basics of California's School Finance System* (11/06) (also in Spanish)

* *Q&A: The School District Budget Process* (11/06) (also in Spanish)

General Background

TOPIC	CARD
Charter Schools	15
Class Size Reduction	16
Data Collection and Reporting	17
Governance of Public Schools	18
Instructional Materials	19
Special Education	20

Issues and Actions in California Education Policy: Setting the Stage for 2006 (1/06)

How Are California's Charter Schools Performing? (5/05* and 5/06)

Charter Schools in California: An Experiment Coming of Age (6/04)

* Q&A: *Charter Schools in California* (5/05) (also in Spanish)

* *Show Me the Data: EdSource Forum focuses on using and improving data, and on NCLB* (5/03)

* *California's School Data System: In Need of Improvement* (5/02)

* *Aligning California's Education Reforms* (1/01)

EdSource®
Clarifying Complex Education Issues™

For a comprehensive view of California's school finance system, see: **www.californiaschoolfinance.org**

** Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.*

Budget Calendar

Card 9

School District Dates

January District projects enrollments and staffing, begins developing budget for next fiscal year.

March 15 Initial notice to lay off nonsupervisory certificated staff, such as teachers, librarians, and counselors, if necessary.

May 15 Final notice to lay off teachers, et al., if necessary.

*** July 1** Deadline for district to hold public hearing, adopt budget, and file with county superintendent.

*** Within 45 days** of State Budget Act signing, district makes public any revisions to budget.

August 15 County superintendent approves, gives conditional approval, or rejects district budget.

If Budget Disapproved:

*** September 8** District files revised budget with county superintendent.

October 8 Budget Review Committee at the county office of education forms to make its recommendations.

November 30 County superintendent develops and adopts fiscal plan/budget for district, using Budget Review Committee input.

* Districts may use a schedule with two sets of public hearings and budget adoptions. These budgets are also reviewed by the county superintendent.

Classified employees must have a 30-day notice of intent not to rehire; for superintendents, assistant superintendents, and other senior management, the time is 45 days before expiration of contract.

State Dates

December 1 In even-numbered years, the first year of a two-year legislative session begins.

January 2 The second year of a two-year legislative session begins.

January 10 Governor submits proposed budget.

February Legislative Analyst releases *Analysis of the Budget Bill and Perspectives and Issues.*

May Governor issues "May Revision" to his/her proposed budget to reflect updated revenue and expenditure estimates.

June 15 Legislature faces deadline to pass Budget Bill. The governor must respond to the Budget Bill within 12 working days after legislative approval or it becomes law.

September Legislative session typically ends.

October Governor faces deadline to sign or veto bills, some of which may have a budgetary impact (30 days after Legislature adjourns).

The fiscal year for public agencies, including school districts and county offices of education, is July 1 to June 30.

See: *School District and State Budget Cycle Calendar*, EdSource (1/05)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Proposition 13, Property Tax Amendment (1978)
Gann Limit on Spending Tax Revenues (1980)

Proposition 13: Definition

This initiative, passed by voters in June 1978, amended the California Constitution so that property taxes can be no more than 1% of assessed value. Annual increases in assessed value are capped at 2% or the percentage growth in the state's Consumer Price Index (CPI), whichever is less. (It has been less than 2% only a few times since 1977.) However, if owners sell or remodel their individual properties, the assessed value is typically raised.

Thus property owners who keep their property as is for many years pay much less property tax than their neighbors who have just bought or remodeled their properties.

Impact

Until 1978, property taxes furnished about two-thirds of education's revenues, with state funds providing much of the rest. Proposition 13 drastically reduced property taxes, which prompted the Legislature to backfill with state funds. The net result was a near reversal in the ratio of state to local funds. The governor and Legislature also took over the allocation of local property taxes to schools, cities, counties, and special districts.

Annual increases in property tax revenues do not change the total amount of funding for most school districts because their state aid is reduced to keep general-purpose income within their revenue limits. (See Card 12.) In less than 10% of districts, however, property taxes exceed their revenue limits; these districts are allowed to keep this additional revenue.

Local voters can levy a tax on residential or commercial properties (called a parcel tax), but they cannot increase property taxes based on value. The one exception is that school districts can levy taxes for general obligation (G.O.) bonds for school construction or renovation. Parcel taxes need a two-thirds majority to pass. But with the passage of Proposition 39 in 2000, G.O. bonds can be passed with a 55% majority. (See Card 4.)

Gann Limit: Definition

This constitutional amendment, passed by voters in 1979, is named after its sponsor, the late Paul Gann. It limits the amount of tax revenues that state and local governments, including school districts, can spend. The amount is adjusted annually for changes in per capita (or per resident) personal income and population, including enrollment in kindergarten-through-12th grade (K–12) schools and community colleges. The amount can also be adjusted for transfers of responsibility between governmental units, and local voters can increase Gann limits. Certain expenditures—such as debt service, meeting federal or court mandates, qualified capital outlay, and addressing emergencies such as natural disasters—are exempted.

Impact

Senate Bill 1342, the implementing legislation, defined school district Gann limits in a way that has thus far minimized their impact.

Only once, in 1986–87, did the state exceed its Gann Limit and refund $1.1 billion to taxpayers. As subsequently amended by Proposition 98 (see Card 11), if state tax revenues exceed the Gann spending limit for two consecutive years, half of the excess must be returned to taxpayers and the other half goes to K–12 schools.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Provisions

This constitutional amendment, approved by voters in November 1988, took effect in the 1988–89 school year. As amended by Proposition 111 in 1990, it has four general provisions:

- Minimum funding guarantee for K–12 schools and community colleges based on three tests (see right);
- Payment to K–14 education of 50% of the excess when state tax revenues exceed the Gann spending limit for two consecutive years (see Card 10), with the remaining 50% rebated to taxpayers;
- Annual School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs) listing at least 13 specific items for each school; and
- "Prudent" state budget reserve.

Proposition 98 may be suspended for a year by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature and signature of the governor.

Impact

The calculation of the guaranteed amount is largely based on the condition of the state's economy:

- In years of "normal" state revenue growth, K–14 education receives at least the same amount as the previous year, adjusted for changes in enrollment based on average daily attendance (ADA) and per capita personal income.
- When revenue growth from one year to the next is particularly low, K–14 education participates in the state's losses according to specified "fair share" formulas.
- Following a "fair share" reduction that causes the Proposition 98 funding guarantee to lag normal growth, the state is obligated to eventually restore K–14 funding to what it would have been if no reduction had occurred.

In practice, Proposition 98 has meant that education is entitled to the same amount allocated the previous year, plus enrollment growth (based on ADA) and an inflation adjustment equal to the change in per capita personal income in the state. This is generally referred to as Test 2 (see below). In difficult economic years, the state can provide a lesser amount as specified in Test 3. The shortfall must be restored in a future year when state tax revenues grow faster than personal income by a specified amount.

In 2004–05 Proposition 98 was suspended. A suspension allows the state to fund education at a lower level in the current year, and that level becomes the new Proposition 98 base that gets adjusted going forward. When state tax (General Fund) revenues grow faster than personal income by a specified amount, the state must begin restoring funding to what it would have been had no suspension occurred. (The difference between actual funding and that obligatory amount is called the "maintenance factor.") But the state does not have to pay back the savings it realized from the suspension in the intervening years.

The Tests

Test 1— About 41% of the state budget, a threshold the state has easily exceeded each year. Test 1 would apply if state tax revenues increased dramatically such that 41% of the state budget would be more than the Test 2 guarantee.

Test 2— Same amount as previous year, plus enrollment growth (based on ADA) and inflation adjustment based on growth in per capita personal income. (This test has been used most often.)

Test 3— Used in difficult economic years. Same as Test 2 except the inflation adjustment is the annual change (increase or decrease) in per capita General Fund revenues plus one-half percent.

See: *Proposition 98 guarantees a minimum level of funding for public schools* (10/06) at: **www.edsource.org/pub_update_prop98.cfm**

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Revenue Limits for School Districts

Total District Income

General Purpose (Per-pupil Revenue Limit × ADA)
+ Special Purpose (Categorical Aid)
+ Miscellaneous Local & Other
+ Lottery
= Total District Income

ADA (Average Daily Attendance)

ADA is the average number of students present each day of the school year. Since 1998–99 students with excused absences have not been included in ADA. Only students attending school are counted.

Revenue Limit Definition

The basic general-purpose money for each student—the revenue limit—is calculated separately for each district. The concept of revenue limits was established by law in 1972. The per-pupil amount varies by type of district (elementary, unified, high school). Extra funding is given to districts defined as "small," creating a total of six revenue-limit categories. Small is defined as fewer than 101 pupils (elementary), 301 students (high school), and 1,501 students (unified).

Revenue-limit income is a combination of local property taxes and state money. Any increase in property taxes is offset by a reduction of state funds. Revenue limits were adjusted in 1998–99 to account for the new definition of ADA (see above). In 2006–07 statewide average per-pupil revenue limits by type of district are estimated to be $5,334 (elementary), $5,564 (unified), and $6,405 (high school).*

Property Taxes and Basic Aid

In some districts, the amount of their property taxes exceeds their revenue limit. In the past, they kept all of it and still received state "basic aid" of $120 per student (based on average daily attendance or ADA)—or a minimum of $2,400 per district—according to the California Constitution. Because of budget constraints in 2002–03, lawmakers eliminated the $120, saying that the state met its constitutional obligation to these districts with other state funding from categorical (special-purpose) programs. Generally less than 10% of districts are "basic aid" (or "excess revenue") districts.

Serrano v. Priest and Funding Equity

This 1976 California Supreme Court decision called for per-pupil amounts of general-purpose revenues for schools (revenue limits) to be equalized within certain parameters, one of which was the type of school district. By 1983 revenue limits were sufficiently equitable to satisfy the court order that called for the vast majority of students to attend school in districts with revenue limits within $100 of each other. Subsequently, an inflation factor for that band was added, bringing the allowable difference in revenue limits up to about $350 by 2000.

Cost-of-living Adjustment (COLA)

The state usually grants a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to school districts for revenue limits and categorical programs. For revenue limits, the law ties the COLA to the current inflation rate. The amount actually paid depends upon the legislative appropriation. In 2006–07, $2.6 billion was set aside to cover a 5.92% COLA, which applies to districts' general-purpose funds (revenue limits) and state categorical programs.

* Estimate by School Services of California, Inc., 9/06

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Revenues for School Districts (Other Sources)

Along with receiving a set amount of local property taxes, plus funds from the state and federal governments, school districts have a limited ability to raise additional revenues. Some of these revenues can be used as operating funds, while others must be spent on capital projects.

Operating Funds

Sources for operating funds include parcel taxes, community contributions, food service sales, and interest on investments.

Parcel Taxes

Although Proposition 13 prevents districts from asking voters to increase tax rates on property, it does allow the collection of special taxes not related to property value (non-*ad valorem*) if two-thirds of the electorate in the district approves. From 1983 through 2006, districts have held 416 parcel tax elections, usually for specific programs. Of these, 211 (51%) won the necessary vote, while another 144 (35%) achieved a majority vote but did not pass. (See Card 6.)

School Foundations and Private Contributions

Some districts receive significant income from contributions or grants from individuals and local businesses. Based on reports to the California Consortium of Education Foundations (CCEF), more than 600 foundations have formed to support local schools in California. The amount of money raised in 2005 was estimated in excess of $100 million.

Surplus Property

Districts can raise revenues by selling or leasing unused school buildings or school sites. However, sometimes the law restricts how those revenues can be spent, often requiring that they be used for capital projects.

Capital Funds

Capital funds can come from general obligation bonds, school facility improvement districts, and developer fees. They must be used to build or improve facilities.

Bonds

As a result of the approval of Proposition 39 in November 2000 and related legislation, either 55% or two-thirds of local voters may authorize general obligation (G.O.) bonds. If districts choose to seek 55% voter approval, they face added requirements involving financial and performance accountability as well as limits on the amount of property tax increase they can request to repay the bonds. Prior to 2001, the approval threshold for all G.O. bonds was two-thirds. (See Card 5.)

School Facility Improvement Districts

School districts are also able to tax just a portion of their districts—often new housing developments—by establishing a Mello-Roos Community Facility District or a School Facility Improvement District (SFID). Under Mello-Roos, which requires two-thirds voter approval, property owners pay a special tax based on a formula. An SFID also taxes just a portion of the school district but is a general obligation bond based on the value of the property. A law passed in July 2001 allowed the voter-approval threshold for SFIDs to be either two-thirds or 55% (with added accountability provisions). Prior to July 2001, a two-thirds vote was required. (See Card 4.) SFIDs appear to have almost replaced Mello-Roos elections. From 1983 through 2006, 62 Mello-Roos elections were held and 30 (48%) succeeded, but only one election took place in 2005 and none in 2006.

Developer Fees

Developer fees authorized by the school district governing board may be levied on new construction within a district.

See: Voter Guide: *Proposition 39*, EdSource (9/00)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

School Finance Chronology

1972 **Senate Bill (SB) 90** Established revenue limits—a ceiling on the amount of general purpose money each school district can receive per pupil.

1976 ***Serrano v. Priest*** California Supreme Court ruling on a 1968 lawsuit alleging that the system of school finance was inequitable. (See Card 12.) The state Legislature responded with Assembly Bill (AB) 65 in 1977 and made other changes with AB 8 in 1979.

1978 **Proposition 13** Constitutional amendment limiting property tax rates and increases. (See Card 10.)

1979 **Assembly Bill (AB) 8** Funding structure for schools after Proposition 13, with a revised formula for dividing property taxes. Created the "*Serrano* squeeze" by granting larger inflation increases to low-revenue districts. (See Card 12.)

1979 **Gann Limit** Constitutional limit on spending at every level of government, including school districts. (See Card 10.)

1981 **AB 777** Revisions to school finance formulas, procedures for requesting waivers from portions of the Education Code, and consolidation of some categorical programs at the local level.

1983 **SB 813** Major reform law to improve California schools through such programs as mentor teachers, longer school day/year, higher beginning teachers' salaries, more rigorous graduation requirements, and statewide curriculum standards.

1984 **Lottery** Constitutional amendment creating the California State Lottery, with a percentage of winnings for public education. (See Card 8.)

1988 **Proposition 98** Constitutional amendment guaranteeing a minimum funding level for schools. (See Card 11.)

1990 **Proposition 111** Altered Gann limits to allow government spending to keep pace with growth in per capita income.

1991 **AB 1200** Put county offices of education in charge of reviewing districts' financial statements and certifying their financial viability. (See Card 9.) It also created the state Fiscal Crisis & Management Assistance Team (FCMAT). AB 2756 (2004) required the state to update oversight standards and strengthen the district budget review process.

1996 **SB 1777** Instituted incentive payments to reduce class size in primary grades. (See Card 16.)

2000 **Proposition 39** Reduced approval threshold for local school district general obligation bonds to 55% "yes" vote, with some additional regulations. (See Card 13.)

2001 **SB 982** Response to a court ruling that California should pay for extra Special Education mandates. (See Card 20.)

2004 ***Williams v. California*** lawsuit, originally filed in 2000, charging that the state has failed to give thousands of children the basic tools necessary for their education. The 2004 settlement included accountability measures, extra financial support, and other help for low-performing schools. It also required all schools to report the condition of their facilities, teacher misassignments and vacancies, and textbook availability.

Funding for education is usually part of the Budget Act and follow-up legislation.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Definition

A public school governed by a contract ("charter") between the school's operators and a chartering authority (generally a school district, but possibly a county office of education or the State Board of Education). The charter describes many aspects of the school, such as its instructional approach, employer/employee relations, and the student outcomes for which it will be held accountable.

Charter schools may be newly established or converted from an existing school. They are usually created and run by teachers, parents, or a community-based organization. Charter schools tend to be more independent of their chartering authorities than "regular" public schools are of their districts, and charter schools are exempt from most of the state's education laws. However, charter schools must be nondiscriminatory, participate in state testing, and comply with No Child Left Behind (NCLB). (See cards 24 and 25.)

Charters are generally granted for five years and are renewable, but they can also be revoked if the school fails to comply with the contract terms or meet academic objectives.

Funding

Charter schools may receive funding through their chartering agency or directly from the state. Either way, these schools receive general purpose and categorical revenues. The amount of general purpose funding a charter school receives depends upon the grade level of the students. For 2006–07 the per-pupil amounts ranged from an estimated $5,560 for grades K–3 to $6,737 for grades 9–12.

Charter schools' categorical funding comes in three forms:

1) a discretionary block grant that consolidates funding from about 45 programs;
2) discretionary funds for educationally disadvantaged students (English learners and low-income students, with double funding for students who fit both categories); and
3) individual programs not included in either of the above block grants, with the same requirements that apply to districts.

In addition, loans from the state, as well as federal grants, are available for start-up costs.

Charter schools can also secure support for facilities in a number of ways. Proposition 39 (2000) requires districts to provide charter schools of a certain minimum size with "sufficient" facilities that are "furnished and equipped" and reasonably close to where the charter school wishes to locate. State bond funds are also available for construction of charter schools, and the state provides charters serving large percentages of poor students up to $750 per student for rent or lease costs.

Laws

The Charter Schools Act of 1992 (SB 1448, Hart) initiated charter schools in California, limiting the number to 100. In 1998 Assembly Bill (AB) 544 (Lempert) permitted the addition of 250 charter schools in 1998–99 and 100 each year thereafter.

In response to alleged financial misconduct by a few charter schools, lawmakers in 2002 passed AB 1994 (Reyes), which tightens the charter approval process, curtails the freedom of charter schools to serve any grade, restricts their ability to operate multiple sites, and tries to force them to locate their operations completely within the boundaries of their chartering authority. It also authorizes the county superintendent of schools to monitor local charter schools. In 2003 lawmakers passed AB 1137 (Reyes), which increased the accountability of charter schools by creating new performance requirements and requiring more oversight by chartering authorities. It also added four programs to the categorical block grant. In 2005 legislators enacted AB 740 (Huff), which made that grant amount more predictable and more generous, raising it from about $287 per pupil in 2005–06 to $400 in 2006–07 and $500 in 2007–08.

CALIFORNIA CHARTER SCHOOLS

Year	No. of Schools	Enrollment
2005–06	544	197,709*
2003–04	454	167,764
2001–02	363	132,643
1999–00	245	99,048
1997–98	125	48,101
1995–96	83	30,977
1993–94	31	10,761

* Represents 3.1% of statewide public school enrollment. Also note that the enrollment figures are underestimated because each year a few of the schools that are counted in this chart did not report their enrollment to the state, often because they opened after the reporting date.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Class Size Reduction for K–3

Class Size Reduction (CSR), an incentive program to reduce class size in early grades, began in 1996. Participating schools receive funding for each K–3 classroom with a pupil-teacher ratio of about 20 to one. Districts must collect information for evaluating the program. CSR classes must be conducted in separate classrooms to ensure funding. Schools may elect either to provide a full school day with small classes or a half day (with partial funding).

In the past, if a classroom exceeded an enrollment of 20.44 students—based on the average number of students between the start of the school year and April 15—the district would lose its entire CSR apportionment for that classroom. Senate Bill 311, which became law in 2004, reduces the penalty if a school modestly exceeds the annual cap. A 21.95 student average is the new maximum that triggers the full penalty, with interim deductions of 20%, 40%, and 80% for each one-half student above the 20.44 class average.

K–3 Funding and Participation

In 2006–07 districts offering a full school day with smaller classes received $1,024 per participating student, while schools offering the half-day program received $512 per pupil. The state earmarked a total of $1.76 billion for K–3 CSR.

Of the state's 890 eligible districts in 2005–06, only eight opted out. Altogether 882 districts plus 170 charter schools offered CSR classes, most with a full-day program. The number of CSR classes grew steadily from the initial 51,612 in 1996–97 until 2002–03 when 98,110 classes participated (95.9% of K–3 enrollment). The table below shows a slight dip in the following years.

K–3 CSR Evaluation

The state commissioned an evaluation of K–3 CSR by the CSR Research Consortium (which included EdSource). Among other findings, the June 2002 study's authors reported:

- Implementation of CSR occurred rapidly, though it lagged in schools serving minority and low-income students;
- The relationship of CSR to student achievement was unclear;
- CSR created a demand for teachers that resulted in schools' hiring more teachers who were not fully credentialed, with most of them in schools serving the most disadvantaged students;
- Classroom space and dollars were taken from other programs to support CSR.

Ninth Grade CSR

In 1997–98 the state authorized funding to also reduce class sizes in two grade 9 courses: English and one other core academic subject—mathematics, science, or history/social science. Average class size must be no larger than 20, with no single class larger than 22.

Ninth Grade Funding and Participation

In 2006–07 the state apportioned $102 million for ninth grade CSR, and school districts received $204 per ninth grade pupil taught under the program.

In 2005–06 the equivalent of 295,581 9th graders—54% of 9th-grade enrollment—took part for a full year in CSR English classes. In the other core subject areas, the equivalent of 148,924 participated in mathematics, 3,327 in social studies, and 1,927 in science. A total of 891 schools in 259 districts were in the high school program.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

See: *What We Have Learned About Class Size Reduction in California,* CSR Research Consortium (9/02)
(An executive summary with the same title can be downloaded for free from: **www.edsource.org***)*

K–3 CSR PARTICIPATION

Year	Classes Participating	Students Participating	Percent of K–3 Enrollment
2005–06	93,614	1,746,419	93.3%
2004–05	94,044	1,762,845	93.3%
2003–04	94,767	1,785,293	93.5%

Data: CDE

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Public agencies and private groups collect data from schools and districts for a variety of purposes, including to monitor for regulatory compliance, to ensure local and state accountability for improving student achievement, and to study the impact programs and practices have on student performance. Much of the data is available online.

California Data Sources

California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) A data collection from California public schools that includes information on student demographics, enrollment, graduates and dropouts, and staff. The California Department of Education (CDE) collects this data annually in October.
www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd

DataQuest A CDE database that allows users to create customized reports of CBEDS data by school, district, county, and the state.
http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest

Education Data Partnership (Ed-Data) A state-funded interactive database with financial, demographic, and accountability data for schools, districts, counties, and the state. The database also has powerful comparison functions. **www.ed-data.k12.ca.us**

Standards and Assessment Division The CDE division responsible for administering, collecting, and reporting data on all of California's statewide standardized tests.
www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/or

Policy and Evaluation Division The CDE division that calculates and reports the accountability data. Data are available at the school, district, county, and state levels.
www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/or

School Fiscal Services The division of the CDE that provides district financial and accounting data and information.
www.cde.ca.gov/re/di/or

Department of Finance (State of California) A state agency that provides data files on population projections, revenue estimates, and budget analyses. **www.dof.ca.gov**

National Data Sources

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) The primary federal entity that collects and analyzes education data from the United States and other nations on demographics, finance, staffing, school characteristics, and student performance—including the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). **http://nces.ed.gov**

National Education Association (NEA) National organization of teachers and other education professionals that collects and reports enrollment, expenditures, class size, teacher salary, and other data for states and the nation as a whole. It also ranks states based on the data. **www.nea.org**

School Matters A collaborative effort of the Council of Chief State School Officers, Standard & Poor's School Evaluation Services, and CELT (Center for Expansion of Language and Thinking), a nonprofit educational corporation. School Matters is a national clearinghouse for education information and analysis, with information on individual states and the nation as a whole.
www.schoolmatters.com

State Data Services in Development

California School Information Services (CSIS) A state-funded effort that operates independently of the CDE, CSIS provides a vehicle for collecting data extracted from district student information systems. Participation in CSIS is voluntary. As of March 2007, 256 districts used CSIS to electronically transmit data. **www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cs**

California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) This system will focus on providing accurate individual student performance data over time. Scheduled for completion in 2009–10, CALPADS is expected to include only the data elements required by the federal government as part of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). (California is also developing the California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System or CALTIDES to connect teacher information currently scattered among numerous public agencies.) To see updates on CALPADS, go to: **www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl**

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Federal

The federal government influences the governance of public schools primarily through requirements that the state must meet in order to receive funding for special purposes. The most notable of these are the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and Special Education. (See cards 20, 24, and 25.) Some federal laws—such as accessibility requirements for disabled students and anti-discrimination statutes—also affect schools.

State

The state government in California largely controls education funding. Beyond the budget, the governor and Legislature can make laws that influence every facet of school operations. California's secretary of education is appointed by the governor to advise the governor on education matters.

The State Board of Education (SBE), appointed by the governor with the approval of the state Senate, is the governing body for the California Department of Education (CDE). The SBE is responsible for approving curriculum frameworks, textbooks, statewide assessments, and standards for student performance. It acts as a court of appeals for various local decisions (such as school district reorganization) and approves regulations drafted by the superintendent of public instruction (SPI) to implement new laws.

Voters elect the SPI, who administers the day-to-day operation of the CDE under the policies of the SBE and who advocates for the public K–12 school system. The CDE's work includes administering and enforcing state education laws; advising school districts on legal, financial, and program matters; and collecting, analyzing, and disseminating financial, demographic, and other data about public education.

Local

Every school district has a publicly elected governing board, which is responsible for governing and managing local schools within the limits of state and federal law. Together with the school district administration, the school board is responsible for many fiscal, personnel, instructional, and student-related policies, such as adopting the budget, negotiating with employee unions, and hiring or firing the superintendent.

The role of schools and their school site councils or other parent/staff groups depends on how much autonomy the district gives to its schools. Principals are responsible for helping teachers improve student academic achievement, developing a positive school culture, and managing personnel and operations effectively.

County

All 58 county offices of education (COEs) in California are operated by a superintendent and board, but the methods for selecting the members of the governance team vary. In general, county offices provide:

- Business, administrative, and curriculum services to school districts.
- Financial oversight of districts and charter schools.
- Support and oversight of low-performing schools.
- Educational programs for certain students, such as classes for homeless students and pregnant minors. By law, some statewide programs—such as Juvenile Hall and the Homes and Camp Program—are offered only by county offices. In other cases, both county offices and school districts provide similar services, such as vocational education and Special Education for students with disabilities.

COE services are affected by the type of districts within the county, the geographical location and size of the county, and the special needs of students that are not met by districts within the county. Generally, county offices provide more services to smaller districts.

Employee Unions

The California Government Code gives teachers and most other school employees the right to be represented by a union and to engage in collective bargaining. (See Card 32.)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Definition

Instructional materials include textbooks, technology-based materials (e.g., software), workbooks, science kits, and tests.

Adoption of K–8 Instructional Materials

The State Board of Education (SBE) adopts instructional materials in each subject with advice from an 18-member Curriculum Commission. The commission evaluates and recommends materials based on criteria described in curriculum frameworks that the SBE adopts every six to eight years. The materials adoption process is as follows:

- Publishers submit instructional materials for consideration to the SBE.
- The Curriculum Commission oversees an evaluation process with three concurrent steps:
    - Materials undergo "social content review" to ensure that they accurately portray the cultural and racial diversity of American society and do not contain inappropriate company logos or references to commercial products.
    - Doctorate-level experts, educators, parents, and others review materials for usability, accuracy, and alignment to SBE-adopted academic content standards, which specify what students in each grade should know and be able to do.
    - The public comments on submitted materials.
- The SBE holds a "primary" materials adoption.
- In two to four years, the SBE holds a "follow-up" adoption to broaden the selection of materials and allow publishers to modify unaccepted materials so they meet the evaluation criteria.

Since 1998 the SBE has adopted standards-based instructional materials for English language arts, mathematics, science, history/social science, and visual and performing arts. It has also adopted materials for health and foreign languages—neither of which currently has state content standards. For a list of these materials, go to: **www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf**

Grades 9–12

The SBE does not adopt instructional materials for grades 9 to 12. Instead, districts select them, using SBE-adopted curriculum frameworks and "standards maps" for guidance. (Standards maps, provided by textbook publishers, demonstrate how materials align with the state's standards.)

Funding for Instructional Materials

In 2002–03 the state created the Instructional Materials Funding Realignment Program (IMFRP), which received $404 million in 2006–07. The IMFRP requires districts to provide standards-based materials for pupils by the start of the school year that begins within two years of the adoption of materials by the state for K–8 and by the district for 9–12. Under certain circumstances, the SBE can grant a waiver of that deadline.

Districts may use some IMFRP funding on related costs but only after they take specific actions. Such costs could include supplemental materials, professional development, and assessment materials.

As part of the settlement of the *Williams* class action lawsuit (see Card 14), the state in 2004–05 allocated an additional $138 million for extra instructional materials for schools that scored in the bottom 20% on the Academic Performance Index (API) rankings in 2003. In addition, at the start of each school year, county superintendents must inspect schools that are in the *bottom 30%* of the API rankings and are *not* in an intervention program in order to make sure those schools have sufficient instructional materials.

The state lottery also provides funding earmarked for instructional materials. (See Card 8.)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Almost 11% of students in California receive Special Education services each year. In 2005–06 schools served 683,178 special-needs students. Of those students, 314,817 had a specific learning disability, making up almost half (46.1%) of those enrolled in Special Education. More than a quarter (26.5% or 181,319) of Special Education students had a speech or language impairment, and 43,739 (6.4%) had mental retardation. Altogether there are 13 categories of disabilities, including visual, orthopedic, or other health impairment; emotional disturbance; autism; hard of hearing, deaf, or deaf-blind; traumatic brain injury; and multiple disability.

Public Law 94-142 (1975), The Education for All Handicapped Act

This federal law required states to provide special services to children with exceptional needs. It also established procedural rights for parents and children. Congressional reauthorization and some changes to the renamed federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) were last enacted in 2004.

Senate Bill 1870 (1980), California's Master Plan for Special Education

Under this plan, each district must provide free, appropriate education to all qualifying individuals, ages infancy through 21, who live within its boundaries. In addition, an assessment (with parental permission) and a program plan (IEP or Individualized Education Program) are required for each special-needs child. The goal is to place students in the "least restrictive environment" in regular classrooms as much as possible (called "mainstreaming" or "inclusion" if for a full day).

Funding in California

In 2006–07 about $3.1 billion of state funds and more than $1.2 billion of federal funds were allocated for Special Education.

Since 1998–99 Special Education funding has been based on the total number of students in K–12 public schools rather than on the number of Special Education students and the services they receive. Money is allocated by regional SELPAs (Special Education Local Plan Areas) to districts and programs serving qualified students. In 2005–06 SELPAs received a minimum base rate of $550.60 for every K–12 student based on average daily attendance (ADA). Members of the SELPA agree on how much each district will receive based on the programs it operates and the students it serves. School districts are also expected to provide their share of funding, typically making up the difference between the SELPA-distributed funds and the actual cost of services.

State funds for Special Education increased dramatically in 2001–02 when the state settled a 1980 lawsuit brought by the Riverside County Office of Education. The state agreed to approve a $100 million permanent increase in Proposition 98 base funding (see Card 11), a one-time General Fund allocation of $270 million to reimburse past costs, and an additional $25 million payment to be allocated annually from 2001–02 through 2010–11.

Despite the increases, the state's share of Special Education funding has been declining compared to the federal contribution. In 1996–97 California contributed 88% of Special Education funds (not counting district monies). Ten years later the state's share had dropped to 73%. This is partly due to a change in policy. The state used to give a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) based on both the state and federal contributions to Special Education. Beginning in 2005–06, the state only pays a COLA for its share of the funds. In 2006–07 that meant that Special Education's COLA was about 70% of what it would have been if the state had included federal funds in determining the allocation.

In 2004–05 the state changed its approach to funding Special Education students who are placed into public or private group homes, licensed children's institutions, or other residential facilities by establishing a set amount based on the level of care required and expanding eligibility for these funds to public agencies.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)
Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)
School Services of California, Inc.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Performance

TOPIC	CARD
Academic Performance Index (API)	21
High School Exit Exam	22
High School Graduation	23
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	24
Program Improvement/Interventions	25
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program	26
STAR Data	27

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

Worthy Goals, Limited Success: Intervention Programs in California (2/07)

* *Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better?* (6/06)

* *School Accountability Under NCLB: Ambitious Goals and Competing Systems* (8/05)

The California High School Exit Exam Gets Real (2/06)

Spotlight on High School Performance (6/05)

How Are California's Charter Schools Performing? (5/05* and 5/06)

* *The Movement To Transform High School* (5/05)

* *The State's Official Measures of School Performance* (6/05) (also in Spanish)

* *No Child Left Behind in California?* (1/04)

California's Lowest Performing Schools (2/03)

Available at EdSource Online only (also in Spanish):
Frequently Asked Questions About the No Child Left Behind Act or NCLB

EdSource®
Clarifying Complex Education Issues™

* *Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.*

Students

TOPIC	CARD
English Learners	28
Enrollments	29
Student Demographics	30

Note: Current and historical data on student enrollments are updated regularly, though the changes are typically insignificant on a statewide basis.

Narrowing the Achievement Gap (1/03)

California's Middle Grade Students (3/04)

* *Middle Grades: The Challenge of Meeting High Expectations* (3/04)

* *Who Are California's Students?* (6/02)

Academic Performance Index (API)

The API is a single-number indicator of the performance of a school's students on state Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program tests administered each spring. (See cards 26 and 27.) High schools also include test scores of students who took the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) throughout the year. (See Card 22.)

API scores are used to rank each school among all schools in the state of the same type (elementary, middle, or high school) and, separately, among the 100 schools most similar in student demographics, teacher qualifications, and other factors. The rankings are 10 performance levels (deciles) that range from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest).

Each year schools receive a "Base API" between 200 and 1000 and a growth target. API scores are in two-year cycles with Base API scores coming out in the first school year and Growth API scores in the second year.

Sample API Cycle Calendar

Spring 2006	Students take STAR tests and the CAHSEE.*
March 2007	2006 Base API scores, based on spring 2006 tests, come out.
Spring 2007	Students take STAR tests and the CAHSEE.*
August 2007	2007 Growth API scores, based on 2007 tests, come out.

*The CAHSEE is administered several times a year.

APIs are calculated for the entire school and for "numerically significant subgroups" of students based on ethnicity, economic status, and, as of 2006, whether they are English learners or require Special Education services. Schools and subgroups with API scores below the state's performance target of 800 are expected to progress each year by 5% of the difference between their Base API score and 800 or by five points, whichever is greater.

API RESULTS†

Median Base API

	Elementary	Middle	High
2005	751	714	680
2004	730	696	668
2003	728	685	658
2002	699	667	643

Percent of Schools that Met Growth Targets+

	Elementary	Middle	High	Overall
2006	58%	43%	39%	53%
2005	68%	66%	69%	68%
2004	46%	55%	50%	48%
2003	82%	69%	67%	78%

† Tests used for the API can vary from cycle to cycle. Subject weights can also vary by school beginning in the 2004–05 cycle. See the explanation under "Components of the API."

+ Based on schoolwide and subgroup Growth API scores.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Components of the API

Scores from several tests are used to compute schools' and subgroups' API scores. Different tests have different weights, and these weights have been altered as new tests have been included in the index over recent years. The weights are always the same for the Base and Growth scores within one API cycle, however. Until the 2004–2005 cycle, each subject had a uniform weight for schools at each level (elementary, middle, and high school). Now the weights can vary somewhat from school to school within the same level and API cycle, depending on which tests are taken and the percentage of students taking each test. The table below shows the weight of each component for "typical" elementary, middle, and high schools.

API COMPONENT WEIGHTS IN "TYPICAL" SCHOOLS FOR 2006–2007 API CYCLE

	K–5	6–8	9–12
California Standards Tests (CSTs)			
English Language Arts	53%	48%	29%
Math	36%	32%	18%
Science	6%	7%	19%
Social Science	N/A	7%	15%
Norm-referenced Test (CAT/6) (Grades 3 & 7 only)			
English Language Arts	3%	4%	N/A
Math	2%	3%	N/A
California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE)*			
English Language Arts	N/A	N/A	10%
Math	N/A	N/A	10%

* Test results from several administrations of the CAHSEE throughout the school year are included.

Note: The percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Data: CDE

School District API

In 2003–04 the state began compiling API scores for local education agencies (districts and county offices of education). These scores are used to meet federal accountability requirements. (See Card 24.)

High School Exit Exam

Beginning with the class of 2006, public high school students must pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in order to graduate. The test is based on California's academic content standards. The English language arts section tests state standards for grades 9 and 10 and includes one writing exercise. The math section covers standards for grades 6 and 7 and Algebra I. Students first take the exit exam in the spring of their sophomore year. They have multiple chances to pass before graduation. If they pass one section of the test, they do not take that section again.

The 10th-grade results are used to help determine whether high schools have made adequate yearly progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). (See Card 24.) Test scores from 10th and 11th grade are used as part of the calculation for high schools' Academic Performance Index (API) scores. (See Card 21.)

Altogether an estimated 400,163 students or 91.4% of the class of 2006 had passed the exit exam by August 2006, according to the California Department of Education (CDE). That left 37,755 students from that class who had not passed. These figures do not include students with disabilities who had not passed the exam and had received an exemption.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities must be allowed to take the exit exam with any accommodations (such as large-sized print) or modifications (such as the use of a calculator) specified for testing in their individualized education programs (IEPs) or Section 504 plans. For the classes of 2006 and 2007, Special Education students who meet certain requirements are exempt from having to pass the exit exam.

California High School Exit Exam Passing Rates

	Class of	All Students	Female	Male	African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	Native American	Pacific Islander	White	Economically Disadvantaged	English Learner+	Reclassified Fluent English+	Special Education†
10th Grade Results	**2006**	**64%**	67%	62%	45%	82%	81%	49%	60%	60%	81%	48%	30%	76%	19%
	2007	**65%**	68%	63%	46%	83%	81%	51%	60%	63%	81%	50%	31%	79%	20%
	2008	**65%**	68%	63%	46%	83%	81%	52%	61%	63%	81%	51%	27%	78%	21%
10th + 11th Grade Results*	**2006**	**78%**	81%	76%	63%	89%	**	68%	**	**	90%	66%	51%	**	36%
	2007	**79%**	81%	77%	64%	89%	**	69%	**	**	90%	68%	52%	**	34%
Final Results (thru 7/06)	**2006**	**91%**	92%	91%	84%	95%	**	86%	**	**	97%	86%	76%	**	48%†

* Because California lacks an individual student identifier, the passing rates are estimates.

** Not available.

\+ See Card 28 for an explanation of these terms.

† Students in Special Education programs who had not passed the CAHSEE by the end of 11th grade and were subsequently exempted from the CAHSEE requirement are excluded from all columns of the table except the last column. In addition, the final row in the Special Education column includes results through the May 2006 administration, not through July 2006.

Data: *Independent Evaluation of the CAHSEE: 2006 Evaluation Report* by Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO)
California Department of Education (CDE)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

High School Graduation

Graduation Course Requirements

California students must pass a minimum number of courses to graduate. School districts, however, can require more than the minimum. State-required courses include:

- Three years of English;
- Two years of math (including Algebra I);
- Three years of social studies (including U.S. history and geography; world history, culture, and geography; a semester in American government and civics; and a semester in economics);
- Two years of science (including biological and physical science);
- One year of visual or performing arts *or* foreign language (which can be American Sign Language);
- Two years of physical education unless exempted.

California High School Exit Exam

Starting with the class of 2006, students must pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) to graduate. (See Card 22.)

Advanced Placement Courses

High school students who study college-level material and score a 3 (of 5) or higher on Advanced Placement (AP) exams in various subjects may receive college credit. Statewide, 25.5% of 11th and 12th graders took at least one AP exam in 2005–06. That compares to 21.1% in 2004–05. (A few high schools offer International Baccalaureate or IB courses with exams that can also qualify for college credit.) Students who earn a "C" or above in AP or IB courses receive additional points in their grade-point averages.

Graduation and Dropout Rates

High school completion is reported using different measures for different purposes. However, any method that does not track individual students over time can produce statistics that are at best estimates.

The one-year dropout rate tracks how many students in a given year have left school, based on enrollment data submitted by schools. Dropouts are defined as grade 7–12 students from the previous year who are not attending school on Information Day (the day in October when the statewide enrollment count is taken) unless they have a legitimate, verifiable reason, such as being ill or suspended.

The statewide dropout rate was 3.1% in 2004–05, with higher rates for African Americans (5.4%), Native Americans (4.3%), Latinos (4.0%), and Pacific Islanders (3.7%) as compared to whites (2.0%), Filipinos (1.6%), and Asians (1.3%).

The graduation rate attempts to measure how many of a group of ninth graders reach graduation. Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the graduation rate is determined by dividing the number of graduates by the number of graduates plus dropouts from the previous four years. In 2004–05 the state graduation rate using this method was 85.0%. However, this method may undercount dropouts because schools do not always know what happens to students when they leave. High schools must have a graduation rate of 82.9% or must improve based on one of two formulas to meet federal NCLB requirements. (See Card 24.)

California traditionally has calculated graduation rates by dividing the number of graduates by the ninth-grade enrollment four years prior. This measure does not count how many students in a cohort left over four years, but rather how many stayed. The graduation rate based on this approach is significantly lower (71.1% in 2004–05). This method may overcount dropouts because it can include students who left the school but did not drop out, such as transfers to another school.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

GRADUATION RATES BY ETHNICITY FOR NCLB, 2004–05

African American	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic/ Latino	Native American/ Alaskan	Pacific Islander	White	Multiple/No Response	Overall
73.7%	94.0%	92.3%	79.1%	81.0%	83.1%	91.2%	83.2%	85.0%

Data: CDE

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

AYP RESULTS BASED ON SCHOOL TYPE

Percent of Schools that Made AMOs

	Elementary	Middle	High	All
2005–06	75%	49%	85%	**73%**
2004–05	68%	45%	86%	**69%**

Percent of Schools that Made AYP

2005–06	73%	47%	59%	**66%**
2004–05	67%	44%	59%	**62%**

Note: Includes alternative schools, direct-funded charter schools, and small schools.

SUBGROUPS' RESULTS ON TESTS USED FOR AYP

Groups	% Proficient in English	% Proficient in Math
All Students	**44.8**	**48.0**
African American	31.7	30.2
Asian	68.2	76.4
Filipino	61.9	64.9
Hispanic/Latino	29.9	35.9
Native American/Alaskan	39.9	40.6
Pacific Islander	42.5	45.8
White	63.8	62.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	29.4	35.8
English Learners	24.8	34.8
Students with Disabilities	19.6	22.4

Note: Students who because of their disability are unable to take the CSTs or CAHSEE take an alternative examination called the California Alternative Performance Assessment (CAPA).

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)—signed into law in January 2002—all students are expected to be proficient in reading and math by 2013–14. "Proficient" in California means: 1) elementary and middle school students scoring "proficient" or "advanced" on California Standards Tests (CSTs) in English language arts and math; 2) for high schools, 10th graders scoring the equivalent of about 75% in English and 70% in math on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE), which is more than what is required to pass.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

The state has set annual benchmarks (called annual measurable objectives, or AMOs) for the percentage of students who should be proficient in English and math in order for schools, districts, and the state to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the 100% proficiency goal. All "significant subgroups" of students based on ethnicity, poverty, disabilities, and status as English learners must achieve these targets. For the 2004–05 through 2006–07 school years, to have made AYP schools must also have: 1) tested 95% of students in each significant subgroup; 2) had an API score of at least 590 or increased it by one point; 3) for high schools, achieved a graduation rate of at least 82.9% or shown improvement under one of two formulas.

In 2005–06 California as a state made AYP. In English 23.0% and in math 23.7% or more of students overall and in each subgroup scored proficient. The Students with Disabilities subgroup was the only one not to meet those targets, but California still made AYP because it used an adjustment for that subgroup that has been approved by the federal government for all states.

The targets (AMOs) for 2004–05 through 2006–07 include:

- Elementary/middle schools and elementary districts: 24.4% proficient in English, 26.5% in math.
- High schools (9–12) and high school districts: 22.3% in English, 20.9% in math.
- Unified (K–12) districts, county offices of education, and high school districts that include students from lower grades: 23.0% in English, 23.7% in math.

District AYP

To make AYP districts must: 1) Meet their targets (AMOs) for the district and all of their significant subgroups; 2) Reach a districtwide minimum Academic Performance Index (API) score, which is 590 for 2004–05 through 2006–07; 3) Have a 95% test participation rate districtwide and for all of their significant subgroups; and 4) If they have high schools as part of their district, meet the graduation rate criterion districtwide.

AYP RESULTS BASED ON DISTRICT TYPE

Percent of Districts that Made AYP

	Elementary	High (9–12)	Unified*	All Districts
2005–06	75%	60%	47%	**63%**
2004–05	71%	72%	42%	**60%**

* Also includes high school districts with lower grades (such as 7–12) and county offices of education.

Data: CDE

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Program Improvement Under NCLB

Only schools that receive federal Title I funds under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) are placed in Program Improvement (PI). Schools enter Year 1 of PI if they do not make "adequate yearly progress" (AYP) for two years in a row on the same indicator. (See Card 24).

Consequences—beginning with such actions as notifying parents of the school's status, allowing students to transfer to a school not in PI, and providing tutoring and professional development—become more severe with each year that a school does not make AYP. By Year 3, corrective action, such as replacing staff or appointing an outside expert, begins. By Year 4, the district and school must develop a plan to restructure the school and implement that plan in Year 5. In a March 2006 report, the Center on Education Policy (CEP) found that most California schools in years 4 and 5 chose the least dramatic restructuring option, which includes changes such as providing teachers with more professional development or adding extra periods for students struggling in math and English.

If a school in PI makes its AYP goals, it retains its current PI status—Year 1, 2, 3, or 4. If it makes AYP for two years in a row, it is released from PI. In 2006, 9,553 schools received AYP reports, 63% of which were Title I schools. In 2006–07, 23% of all California schools were in PI, which includes 12% that were facing corrective action (in Year 3) or restructuring (years 4–5).

2006–07	Elementary	Middle	High	Total
Number of Schools*	5,841	1,418	2,294	**9,553**
Number of Title I Schools+	4,144	867	1,048	**6,063**
Title I Schools in Program Improvement				
Year 1	478	114	127	**719**
Year 2	212	45	82	**339**
Year 3	321	131	30	**482**
Year 4	214	112	17	**343**
Year 5	152	153	52	**357**
Total	**1,377**	**555**	**308**	**2,240**

Note: In 2006–07, 71% of all elementary, 61% of all middle, and 46% of all high schools received Title I funding.

* Includes alternative schools, small schools, and direct-funded charter schools.

\+ Includes alternative schools and small schools. Four schools included in the total have not been labeled as to school type.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Program Improvement for Districts

If for two consecutive years a district or county office of education (COE) does not make AYP on the same indicator, it enters PI. But districts and COEs are exempt from PI if they can show that students in any of three specific grade spans (3–5, 6–8, or 10) have in either year met the AYP indicator that the district as a whole failed. California introduced PI for districts in August 2004. By August 2006, the state had identified 165 districts and COEs (out of 1,034) for PI.

During the first year of PI, districts are expected to do a self-assessment and get support from a county office of education or some other external entity. In addition, the state, with support ($15.5 million) from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, has created a pilot program in which teams from 15 county offices of education will help districts in PI with needs assessments and in other key areas, such as governance, fiscal operations, data systems, and alignment of curricula and assessments to state standards.

If a district does not improve after two years in PI, it faces serious sanctions in the third year, such as replacing staff, restructuring, or abolishing the district. In order to exit PI, a district must make AYP for two consecutive years.

State Interventions

Current state intervention programs include the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) and the Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA).

High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP)

This intervention program, which focuses on schools in the lowest 10% of the Academic Performance Index (API) rankings, provides extra resources to implement an improvement plan. (See Card 21.) In 2006–07 the state allocated $249 million to this program.

Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA)

Offered to schools in the bottom 20% of the API rankings, QEIA's primary goal is to attract experienced teachers to underperforming schools. When fully implemented in 2008–09, it will provide $500 for each K–3 pupil, $900 (grades 4–8), and $1,000 (grades 9–12). (Participating schools will receive two-thirds of these amounts in 2007–08.)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program

Statewide Testing Program

California students in grades 2–11 participate in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program each spring. Parents and schools receive individual student scores. Results for schools, districts, counties, and the state are made public and posted on the Internet each summer. Based on their student test results, schools are given an Academic Performance Index (API) score and ranked. The test results are also used to determine whether schools have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).* (See cards 21, 24, and 25.) The STAR program consists of:

- **California Standards Tests (CSTs)**, based on the state's academic content standards—what students are supposed to learn.
- **California Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition Survey (CAT/6)**, a norm-referenced test of basic skills. A student's scores are national percentile rankings, which indicate the performance of each student relative to a national sample. Beginning in 2005, only 3rd and 7th graders take the CAT/6.
- **Aprenda: La prueba de logros en español, tercera edición (Aprenda 3)**, an additional norm-referenced test in Spanish that must be administered to Spanish-speaking English learners who have been in school in the United States fewer than 12 months when tested or who have been in U.S. schools for a longer period but are receiving instruction in Spanish. In 2007 the state will start phasing in standards-based tests in Spanish for English learners, but those tests are not designed to meet NCLB requirements.

* For high schools, API scores reflect STAR and California High School Exit Exam scores. AYP results are based primarily on exit exam scores.

Special Education Students

Most participate in STAR according to requirements in their individualized education programs (IEPs). The IEP may call for certain accommodations, such as a large-print version of an exam, which do not alter the test. Or it may require modifications, such as allowing the use of a calculator, which do alter the test.

Students who are unable to participate in the STAR program because of severe disabilities are tested with the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA). Teachers observe and record student performance on tasks that are the building blocks of California's academic content standards.

California Standards Tests (CSTs)

The state has set performance levels for student results on the California Standards Tests. Test scores are described as: far below basic, below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced. (For test results, see Card 27.)

English language arts: Reading, vocabulary, and language arts for grades 2–11. Fourth and 7th graders also take writing tests that last about an hour.

Mathematics: Grades 2–11. In grades 2–7 students take tests based on their grade level. Beginning in 8th grade, the CST becomes course-specific, such as Algebra I. Students who have previously completed Algebra II or Integrated Math III take the High School Summative Math CST.

History/Social Science: Students in grades 8, 10, and 11. The 8th grade test covers standards for grades 6–8.

Science: A comprehensive test for grades 5 and 8. In high school, students take tests for specific subjects, such as chemistry. In addition, 10th graders take a life science CST.

Early Assessment Program (EAP)

High school juniors whose schools participate in EAP can choose to take expanded versions of CSTs in English (including an essay) and math (Algebra II or Summative High School Mathematics) to determine college readiness. The results are used by the California State University (CSU) system to exempt students from college placement tests or let students know that they need additional preparation.

Of the nearly 210,000 juniors (50% of all juniors) who took the expanded English test in 2006, 23% were assessed as college-ready. Of the 134,000 juniors who took the expanded math, about 55% were college-ready. (They represented 72% of all high school juniors who were taking Algebra II or a higher-level math course.)

Data: Early Assessment Program (EAP)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Each spring California students in grades 2–11, including English learners, participate in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. The major component of STAR is the California Standards Tests (CSTs) aligned to the state's academic content standards. In addition, 3rd and 7th graders take a norm-referenced test, which compares California with a national sample. (See Card 26.)

California Standards Test Performance Levels in 2006

The state's goal is for all students to score at a "proficient" or "advanced" level.

Percent of Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced

Grades	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
English Language Arts										
English Language Arts	47	37	49	43	41	43	41	44	37	36
(percent taking test)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(98)	(98)	(97)	(96)	(95)
History/Social Science *Grade 8 is a cumulative test; grade 10 is World History; and grade 11 is U.S. History.*										
History/Social Science							34		30	35
(percent taking test)							(98)		(95)	(93)
Science* *Grades 5 and 8 are cumulative tests. High school students take a life science CST in grade 10 and science CSTs based on their courses. State standards do not delineate a specific course order.*										
Science				32			38		35	
(percent taking test)				(99)			(98)		(93)	
Biology								44	29	32
(percent taking test)								(30)	(49)	(21)
Chemistry								32	33	22
(percent taking test)								(1)	(18)	(27)
Earth Science								25	17	21
(percent taking test)								(24)	(6)	(8)
Physics								16	28	41
(percent taking test)								(3)	(2)	(8)

* Some students take Integrated Math and Integrated Science. To find those results and more detailed information on STAR, go to: **http://star.cde.ca.gov**

Grades	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Mathematics* *Once students reach 8th grade, their CSTs are based on the courses they take. The shaded boxes indicate the grade level at which, based on state standards, students are expected to take the relevant course.*										
Mathematics	59	58	54	48	41	41				
(percent taking test)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(99)	(98)				
General Math							26	13		
(percent taking test)							(47)	(21)		
Algebra I							40	19	10	6
(percent taking test)							(47)	(49)	(29)	(16)
Geometry							80	45	15	7
(percent taking test)							(3)	(21)	(31)	(18)
Algebra II							71	61	34	10
(percent taking test)							(<1)	(3)	(19)	(23)
High School Summative								75	64	43
(percent taking test)								(<1)	(3)	(19)

Norm-referenced Test 2006 (CAT/6)

For the statewide results, scores on the California Achievement Tests, Sixth Edition Survey (CAT/6) are averaged and compared to a national sample of students. A score of 50 means that California students are, on average, performing the same as the national sample. A score below 50 means they are performing below average. Starting in 2005, the state tests only 3rd and 7th graders.

NORM-REFERENCED TEST 2005 (CAT/6)

Grade	Reading	Math	Language	Spelling
3	41	58	43	54
7	46	48	48	53

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

CALIFORNIA'S ENGLISH LEARNERS

Primary Language	2005–06	% of Total
Spanish	1,341,369	85.4%
Vietnamese	34,263	2.2%
Cantonese	22,756	1.4%
Hmong	21,907	1.4%
Filipino (Pilipino or Tagalog)	20,556	1.3%
Korean	16,091	1.0%
Others (more than 50 languages)	113,482	7.2%
Total	**1,570,424**	

In 2005–06, 24.9% of California's students were learning English, while an additional 17.8% were redesignated as fluent English proficient (FEP).

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

Chronology

1974 U.S. Supreme Court *Lau v. Nichols* decision ruled that districts must address linguistic deficiencies of language minorities.

1976 Assembly Bill 1329, Bilingual/Bicultural Education Act, required schools with 10 or more children in the same grade with the same foreign language to offer bilingual instruction. Subsequently amended and revised.

1987 Bilingual education laws were allowed to expire, but districts must comply with the intent of the federal *Lau* decision.

1998 Proposition 227, approved by California voters, limited non-English instruction. However, parents may petition a school for instruction in a student's native language.

2006 A pilot research program was established to identify best practices in instruction for English learners.

Funding

Programs for English learners are funded by both federal and state sources, principally Title III of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and state Economic Impact Aid, augmented with local district funds. The total amount spent to teach English learners is difficult to determine because of the flexibility schools have in the use of some funding sources.

English Language Development

Assessment: English learners (ELs) are students whose primary language—as reported by their parents—is not English and whose performance on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) indicates that they do not yet possess the English language skills necessary to succeed in a school's regular instructional program. Students take the CELDT upon initial enrollment and annually thereafter until it is determined that they have mastered English. At that point, they are reclassified fluent English proficient (FEP). The CELDT evaluates listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. In 2005–06, 1,326,625 students took the CELDT Annual Assessment. Another 418,450 took the Initial Assessment.* In addition, ELs take part in the STAR testing program. (See Card 26.)

NCLB requirements: California has set benchmarks—called annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs)—for ELs in three areas. The first two pertain to progressing toward and attaining English proficiency. Beginning in 2006–07, districts were expected to have 52.5% of their ELs meet their individual annual growth target and slightly more than 32.1% attain English proficiency as measured by their CELDT results. By 2013–14, 64% of each district's ELs should make their annual target and 46% should attain proficiency. The third area is the annual measurable objective (AMO) used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP). (See Card 24.) NCLB also requires states to develop standards-based tests in students' native languages to the extent practicable.

Standards: In 1999 the state adopted English language development (ELD) standards in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Instructional materials: In order for their K–8 reading/language arts textbooks to be considered for state adoption, textbook publishers must include a daily instructional component designed for ELs.

* Includes students who tested proficient and were reclassified fluent English proficient (FEP).

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

K–12 ENROLLMENT

	2002–03	2003–04	2004–05	2005–06
Public Schools	6,244,732	6,298,774	6,322,189	6,312,436
Grades K–8	4,413,739	4,421,847	4,385,204	4,337,791
Grades 9–12	1,830,993	1,876,927	1,936,985	1,974,645
Private Schools*	611,350	599,605	591,056	594,597
Total	**6,856,082**	**6,898,379**	**6,913,245**	**6,907,033**

* Includes schools with six or more students. About 74% of private school students are in grades K–8.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (DataQuest, Private Schools Office)

TYPES OF DISTRICTS, 2005–06

	Number
Elementary Districts (K–8)	561
High School Districts (9–12)	88
Unified Districts (K–12)	329
Total	**978**

Data: Education Data Partnership (Ed-Data)

SIZE OF DISTRICTS, 2005–06

	% of Districts*	% of Students
Fewer than 500 Students	31%	1%
500 to 999	12%	1%
1,000 to 14,999	46%	37%
15,000 to 49,999	10%	39%
50,000 and more	1%	22%

* Includes county offices of education and state special school districts.

Data: CDE

Enrollment is the number of students registered in each school and district on a given day in October. The number of pupils enrolled in the school district is usually larger than the average daily attendance (ADA), which is the average number of students who attended school over the course of the year. Enrollment and ADA are both used for funding purposes, depending on the program.

The number and percentage of students in private schools has declined slightly over the past few years, with about 8.6% attending private schools in 2005–06.

California has three types of school districts: elementary (usually kindergarten through grade 8), high school (typically grades 9 to 12), and unified (kindergarten through grade 12). The number of districts usually changes annually because of consolidations or mergers.

In 156 districts, a total of 1,426 schools enrolling 1.19 million students (19% of total public school enrollment) were on a year-round (multitrack *and* single-track) calendar in 2005–06. Most schools—79%—that have year-round programs are elementary schools.

As the chart shows, statewide enrollment is declining in grades K–8 and increasing slightly in high school grades. About half of the districts in the state are facing enrollment declines. While enrollment is falling in a number of coastal counties, many inland counties are seeing increasing numbers of students in all grades.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

CALIFORNIA STUDENTS

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

	2002–03		2003–04		2004–05		2005–06	
African American	515,776	8.3%	510,613	8.1%	505,354	8.0%	495,017	7.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	544,125	8.7%	544,281	8.6%	550,084	8.7%	557,558	8.8%
Filipino	156,549	2.5%	160,400	2.5%	163,157	2.6%	165,572	2.6%
Hispanic/Latino	2,819,633	45.2%	2,898,115	46.0%	2,961,097	46.8%	3,003,735	47.6%
Native American/Alaskan Native	53,955	0.9%	52,706	0.8%	51,823	0.8%	50,758	0.8%
White	2,106,211	33.7%	2,046,422	32.5%	1,981,460	31.3%	1,915,472	30.3%
Multiple/No Response	48,483	0.8%	86,237	1.4%	109,214	1.7%	124,324	2.0%
Total Enrollment	**6,244,732**		**6,298,774**		**6,322,189**		**6,312,436**	

SPECIAL PROGRAMS

English Learners (EL)	1,599,542	25.6%	1,598,535	25.4%	1,591,525	25.2%	1,570,424	24.9%
Special Education (Age 0–22)	675,332	10.8%	681,980	10.8%	681,969	10.8%	683,178	10.8%
Gifted & Talented (GATE)	461,619	7.4%	471,976	7.5%	481,958	7.6%	501,230	7.9%
Free/Reduced-priced Meals*	3,006,877	48.2%	3,078,483	48.9%	3,106,818	49.7%	3,162,439	50.1%

* Students enrolled in this federal program are included even if they attend nonpublic schools. The state also uses a different total enrollment figure (6,179,341 in 2005–06) to determine the percentage of students participating in this program.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (DataQuest)

Special Programs

For information on English learners and Special Education, see cards 28 and 20, respectively.

Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) programs provide a challenging curriculum to students deemed by districts to be intellectually gifted or especially talented in leadership or visual and performing arts. In 2006–07 GATE programs operated in 796 districts statewide. The state allocated $53 million for GATE in 2006–07.

More than half of the student population in 2005–06 qualified for the **National School Lunch Program**, a federal program that provides free and reduced-priced meals based on parent or guardian income.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Staffing

TOPIC	CARD
Administrators in California	31
Collective Bargaining	32
Teacher Credential Requirements	33
Teacher Demographics	34

For more information, see the following EdSource publications, which can be ordered by calling 650/917-9481 or by going online at: www.edsource.org

* *Teacher Pay in California: Is It Fair? Is It Competitive? Is It Enough?* (4/02)
* *Help Wanted: Administrators To Lead California's Schools* (3/01)
* *Update on California's Teacher Workforce Issues* (3/01)
  Strengthening Teacher Quality in California (4/99)
* *Collective Bargaining* (3/99)

Higher Education

TOPIC	CARD
College Eligibility	35
College Enrollments	36
Community Colleges	37

Quality. Access. Low Cost. Can California's Community Colleges Do It All? (3/05)

* *Executive Summary: Quality. Access. Low Cost. Can California's Community Colleges Do It All?* (3/05)

The following publications are available in English and Spanish:

* *A Guide to California's Community Colleges* (4/05)
* *Community College: A first step to a bachelor's degree* (4/05)
* *A Guide to UC Admissions Policies* (4/05)
* *A Guide to CSU Admissions Policies* (4/05)

EdSource®
Clarifying Complex Education Issues™

** Can be downloaded for free from the EdSource website.*

TOTAL ADMINISTRATORS 2005–06

58.2% Female; 41.6% Male*	27,046
Average Years of Education Service	19.7
Average Years in District	13.7

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION 2005–06

African American	8.1%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.5%
Filipino	0.8%
Hispanic/Latino	16.3%
Native American/Alaskan Native	0.6%
White	69.7%
Multiple/No Response	0.9%

* 0.2% No gender reported.
Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (DataQuest)

Administrator Preparation

Currently California has two credentials for certificated administrators—the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential. In 2002 lawmakers passed Senate Bill 1655 (Scott), which streamlined the credentialing process.

Preliminary Credential Requirements

To obtain a preliminary credential, candidates must pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST); possess a valid California teacher, specialist, or services credential; and have completed at least three successful, full-time years in teaching or pupil services in a public school or a private school of equivalent status. In addition, they must do one of the following:

1) Complete a college- or university-based administrator credential program accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC).
2) Complete a CTC-accredited internship program through a college, university, or local education agency.
3) Pass the School Leaders' Licensure Assessment.
4) Complete an alternative program approved by the CTC.

When candidates complete the preliminary credential program, they receive a certificate of eligibility. Once they find employment as an administrator, they exchange the certificate for the preliminary credential, which is valid for five years.

Fully Credentialed Administrator

An administrator who has a preliminary credential and has completed two years as a successful full-time administrator must do one of the following to earn a professional clear credential:

1) Complete a CTC-accredited college- or university-based program.
2) Complete the Administrator Training Act Program.
3) Meet the Mastery of Fieldwork Performance Standards through a CTC-accredited program. Candidates may forego all or part of the course-work component of the program if they can demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities through assessment.
4) Complete an alternative program approved by the CTC.

Valid for five years, the professional clear credential can be renewed upon completion of additional professional growth and service requirements.

Administrators from Outside California

Administrators who have completed an out-of-state administrator program and have met the basic credential and service requirements referenced above qualify for a preliminary credential. If, in addition, they have been an administrator for three or more years, they qualify for a professional clear credential.

Training Program for Chief Business Officers

In 2005–06 lawmakers provided $1.1 million in one-time funds to develop a pilot training program in school finance, school operations, and leadership for chief business officers. In 2006–07 lawmakers allocated another $1.1 million ($3,000 per candidate) for the program.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Collective bargaining is a procedure, regulated by law, for negotiating an employment contract between a school district and employee representatives. California school districts bargain with their unions in a process that can range from adversarial to cooperative.

Success with collective bargaining in the private sector led to passage of the 1965 Winton Act, which required districts and teachers to "meet and confer" on subjects of mutual interest. Ultimate authority, however, rested with the local school board.

Senate Bill 160 (Rodda)

This law established collective bargaining for K–16 (kindergarten through university) employees in 1975, replacing the Winton Act. The law gave employees the right to unionize, and it required school districts to recognize the duly elected unions as the sole bargaining agents and to negotiate only with them.

Employees in a bargaining unit (usually a school district) select one organization as exclusive representative. The largest unions for certificated employees are California Teachers Association (CTA), California Federation of Teachers (CFT), and United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA). For classified employees, the largest are California School Employees Association (CSEA), American Federation of School, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), and Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

Negotiations in private between representatives of the union and the governing board result in a binding contract (for a maximum of three years). Some districts use alternatives to the traditional collective bargaining process, such as trust agreements.

Scope

The topics for negotiations ("scope of bargaining") include "matters relating to wages, hours of employment, and other terms and conditions of employment," such as benefits, leave and transfer policies, safety conditions, class size, evaluation procedures, and grievance procedures. Additional items have been added through court cases, PERB (Public Employment Relations Board) decisions, and the law (e.g., longer school day/year).

The "sunshine clause" of Senate Bill 160 requires that initial proposals be presented for public comment before negotiations begin and that financial consequences be made public before the school board signs a contract.

Effective Jan. 1, 2001, all employees must join the selected union or pay a service fee. Previously, this so-called "organizational security" was subject to negotiation.

In addition, a government code section added in 2004 requires that the superintendent and chief business official of a school district certify in writing that the costs incurred by the district under the proposed collective bargaining agreement can be met during the term of the agreement. This certification, which is submitted to the county superintendent, must also itemize any budget revisions necessary to meet the costs of the agreement.

PERB (Public Employment Relations Board)

Established by Senate Bill 160, this board consists of five members appointed by the governor. They decide matters in dispute, especially about the scope of collective bargaining. PERB also establishes rules regarding various types of disputes, including:

- Unfair labor practices;
- Impasse, mediation, and fact-finding processes if negotiations break down; and
- "Work to rule" and strike actions by employee groups.

Court Ruling on Strikes

In May 1985 the California Supreme Court ruled that strikes by public employees are legal unless the public safety is threatened *(County Sanitation District No. 2 v. Los Angeles County Employees Association).*

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Types of Teaching Credentials

- Multiple-subject: for elementary or middle school.
- Single-subject: for middle or high school.
- Specialist: for reading, Special Education, or instruction of English learners.

Fully Credentialed Teacher

To receive a preliminary credential in California, which is valid for five years, a person must:

- Earn at least a bachelor's degree.
- Pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST); passing scores from other tests (for example, the Graduate Record Exam) will be acceptable in the near future.
- Attain subject-matter knowledge in the subject(s) the individual plans to teach.
- Participate in a state-approved, teacher-preparation program.

To receive a clear credential, a teacher must complete a beginning teacher induction program, which involves assessing the teacher's skills and knowledge and providing individualized support and advanced study in specific areas. Clear credentials may be renewed every five years. In addition, California teachers who are certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards can use their certification to obtain a clear credential. Both the state and federal governments offer incentives to earn certification.

Highly Qualified Teachers

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), all teachers in core academic areas—English, math, science, social sciences, arts, and foreign languages—must be "highly qualified." They must hold a bachelor's degree and either have a credential in the subject they teach or be enrolled in an internship program for fewer than three years.

Alternative Pathways

If a district is unable to recruit suitable credentialed staff, special permits may be issued to teachers who are not yet fully credentialed:

- The Short-Term Staff Permit (STSP) requires the holder to have earned a bachelor's degree, passed the CBEST, and acquired a specified level of subject-matter knowledge. The permit is good for up to one year; an individual can be issued only one STSP in a lifetime.
- Prerequisites for the Provisional Internship Permit (PIP) are the same as for the STSP, but employers must verify that they have conducted a diligent search for a credentialed teacher or an intern and must help the permit holder get into an internship program and work toward earning a credential. The PIP may be renewed—but only once and only if the person has taken all appropriate subject-matter exams and not passed.

In addition, the CTC can waive certain requirements for individuals with private school or out-of-state teaching experience.

Internships, pre-internships, and CalStateTEACH programs allow individuals to hold paid teaching positions while completing their preparation (**www.calstateteach.net**).

Mentoring and Professional Development

Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) provides a formal induction program for teachers during their first two years in the profession. In addition, state and federal support for professional development programs includes a block grant providing general funding, the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program for district-run programs, and Reading First for grades K–3.

Instructional Aides

Paraprofessionals who are supported by federal Title I funds must have *either* completed two years of college *or* passed a district test unless they act primarily as translators.

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

A Shortage of Qualified Teachers

In California, an estimated 21,459 teachers were hired for 2006–07 because of enrollment growth plus teacher retirement and attrition. Over the next decade, California will need to replace about 100,000 teachers to keep up with the projected retirements. (Enrollment is still growing in the high school grades but is decreasing at the elementary and middle school levels.) The demand is especially high in certain urban and inland areas and in subjects such as math and science. There is a serious shortage of Special Education teachers.

In 2005–06, 290,025—or 94.2%—of teachers were fully certified. Another 9,922 teachers (3.2%) were in classrooms under emergency permits. In addition, 11,508 teachers (3.7%) were pre-interns or interns in university or district-sponsored programs. The state also issued 1,298 waivers (0.4% of teachers) to districts for a variety of reasons, allowing them to staff specific classrooms with less than fully credentialed teachers or those teaching "out of field." (Because some teachers hold more than one type of credential, these numbers add up to more than the total number of teachers.)

Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), by June 2006 all teachers in core academic areas—English, math, science, social sciences, arts, and foreign languages—were supposed to have met NCLB's minimum definition of "highly qualified." (See Card 33.) However, as of the beginning of the 2005–06 school year, about 20% of all NCLB core academic classes in California were taught by teachers who did not meet the highly qualified criteria. The federal government provided flexibility on this requirement as none of the states were on track to meet this goal by June 2006. The states were required to submit to the federal government revised plans for meeting this goal by June 2007.

Data: California Department of Education (CDE) (CBEDS)
California's Teaching Force 2006: Key Issues and Trends, Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (CFTL)
California's Revised State Plan for No Child Left Behind: Highly Qualified Teacher (Sept. 29, 2006)

TOTAL TEACHERS 2005–06

72% Female; 28% Male	307,864
Average Years of Teaching	12.7
Average Years in District	10.5

RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION 2005–06

	Teachers	
African American	14,000	4.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	15,459	5.0%
Filipino	3,960	1.3%
Hispanic/Latino	46,830	15.2%
Native American/Alaskan Native	1,826	0.6%
White	221,822	72.1%
Multiple or Not Reported	3,967	1.3%

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS 2005–06

	FTE* Teachers		Average Class Size
Self-contained (usually elementary)	135,103	46.8%	22.3
Middle & High School Courses	105,255	36.4%	28.8
Special Education	28,416	9.8%	10.9
Vocational	5,047	1.7%	25.3
Advanced Placement	3,062	1.1%	26.7
International Baccalaureate	292	0.1%	26.1
Other Instruction-related	11,741	4.1%	19.6

* Full-time equivalent. FTE does not necessarily equal the total number of teachers because more than one teacher's time may be counted toward the hours equivalent to full time. For example, two half-time teachers equal one FTE.

Data: CDE (DataQuest)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Postsecondary Public Education in California

California operates three separate public systems for postsecondary education: two-year community colleges (see Card 37), the four-year California State University (CSU) system, and the more selective four-year University of California (UC) system.

Eligibility for Admissions

CSU and UC

Eligibility to enter either system is based on the successful completion of 15 one-year college prep (referred to as "a–g") courses, high school grades, performance on college admissions exams, advanced course work, and personal attributes.

Periodically both CSU and UC change their eligibility requirements and their admissions review process and criteria. For example, UC raised its minimum grade point average (GPA) from 2.8 to 3.0 beginning with the class entering in fall 2007. The GPA is based on all "a–g" courses taken in 10th and 11th grades.

Required College Prep Courses ("a–g"):

(a) Two history/social science (world and U.S.);
(b) Four English language arts;
(c) Three math (through Algebra II or Integrated Math III);
(d) Two laboratory science (two different disciplines);
(e) Two foreign language (same language);
(f) One visual/performing arts;
(g) One elective from the above subjects.

Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)

Under ELC, the top 4% of each California high school's graduating senior class—based on their grades in and successful completion of college preparatory classes—are granted admission to UC. The program, which began in fall 2001, is designed to attract students from schools that historically have sent few graduates to UC. Altogether almost 24% of 2004 public high school graduates who enrolled in UC in fall 2004 entered through this program.

Early Assessment Program (EAP)

See Card 26 about this CSU college-readiness testing program.

College Admissions Tests

CSU requires *either* the SAT I (critical reading, mathematics, and writing) *or* the ACT Assessment (English, math, reading, and science). But CSU does not use the ACT writing results in its admissions process.

UC requires *either* the SAT I *or* the ACT Assessment plus the ACT Writing Test. In addition, UC requires SAT II Subject Tests in two different subject areas (foreign language, higher math, history, literature, or science).

In 2006, 49% of California's graduating seniors took the SAT as compared to the U.S. average rate of 48%, according to the College Board. The mean (or average) score for the verbal section (critical reading) was 501, math 518, and writing 501. The U.S. mean score for reading was 503, math 518, and writing 497.

In 2006, 14% of California's graduating seniors took the ACT (U.S. average rate: 40%), according to ACT. The mean composite score for California was 21.6 compared to the U.S. mean of 21.1.

CSU/UC ELIGIBILITY RATES BY ETHNIC GROUP
(based on successful completion of "a–g" courses)

	2003–04	2004–05
African American	25.1%	25.2%
Asian	56.2%	58.7%
Filipino	44.8%	46.6%
Hispanic/Latino	21.7%	24.0%
Native American/Alaskan Native	22.3%	23.1%
Pacific Islander	27.2%	27.7%
White	39.5%	40.9%
Multiple/No Response	26.9%	31.0%
Total Eligible	**33.7%**	**35.2%**

Data: California Department of Education (CDE)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC COLLEGE SYSTEMS

	Number of Campuses, 2006–07	Undergraduate Enrollment Fall 2000	Undergraduate Enrollment Fall 2005
Community Colleges	109	1,585,350	1,607,316
California State Univ.	23	325,235	354,146
Univ. of California	10	141,366*	159,066*

* These totals include health sciences majors, who are often excluded in UC enrollment figures. In 2005, 133 students were health sciences majors at UC compared to 338 students in 2000.

Data: California Community Colleges; CSU; UC

In fall 2005 about 47% of California's public high school graduates went to UC, CSU, or a public state community college, down from 48% in fall 2004. The California Master Plan for Higher Education specifies that UC accept the top eighth and CSU accept the top third of state high school graduates (including those who are also UC-eligible) who apply on time. A little more than half of those accepted actually enroll.

FALL 2005 COLLEGE-GOING RATES

(of the California Public High School Graduating Class of 2005)

University of California (UC)	California State University (CSU)	California Community Colleges
6.8%	10.7%	29.0%

Data: California Postsecondary Education Commission

Admission and Enrollment Rates

Admission rates are the number of all first-time freshmen admitted divided by the number who applied. The UC numbers mask the differences among the universities. For example, in fall 2005 UCLA and UC-Berkeley accepted 28% of their applicants, while UC-Merced accepted 87%. UC's overall admission rate of 86% occurs because most applicants apply to more than one campus. CSUs also have a wide range, with Dominguez Hills accepting only 11% of applicants while Chico accepted 80% in fall 2005.

FALL 2005 ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT

California Residents* Who Applied, Were Admitted, and Enrolled as First-Time Freshmen

	Applied	Admitted	Admission Rates	Enrolled
UC	65,851	56,502	86%	30,083
CSU	124,686	92,409	74%	45,846

Note: The data in the table above include high school seniors from public and private schools.

* The CSU enrollment number includes 1,610 out-of-state and international students.

Data: UC Office of the President; CSU, Statistical Reports

In November 1996 voters passed Proposition 209, which forbade state agencies and educational institutions from granting preferential treatment to anyone on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. It first affected the fall 1998 freshman class.

When comparing 2005 with 1997 admissions data, UC admission rates dropped for African American, Latino/Chicano, and Native American students and rose for all others.

UC ADMISSIONS RATES BY ETHNICITY

(Fall 1997 and Fall 2005)

	African American	Asian/ East Indian/ Pakistani	Filipino	Latino/ Chicano	Native American	White	Other/ Unknown
1997	72.7%	85.2%	79.2%	82.8%	86.3%	81.8%	83.1%
2005	66.1%	89.0%	85.5%	78.4%	79.7%	89.4%	87.4%
Difference	-6.6%	3.8%	6.3%	-4.4%	-6.6%	7.6%	4.3%

Data: UC Office of the President

UC has tried to address the issue of underrepresented students with a program, Eligibility in the Local Context. (See Card 35.)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Community colleges aim to provide college access to all California students who want to attend. They serve almost three-quarters of California's public higher education students through:

- Courses leading to an associate degree in academic and technical fields; many then transfer to four-year colleges.
- Training or certificate programs in health, high-technology, or other occupational fields.
- Remedial courses for students who need additional assistance before starting college courses.
- Continuing education for the general community.

Eligibility

Students must be at least 18 years old for regular enrollment, but a high school diploma is not required. High school students can also enroll to take college-level courses.

While the vast majority of students are California residents, each district has its own policy on whether out-of-state residents can attend.

Configuration

The 109 community colleges statewide are organized into 72 districts. District sizes vary—from 10 colleges and 125,636 students in Los Angeles for spring 2006 to one college and 1,178 students in Marin.

Local community colleges have autonomy to make decisions about administration, curriculum, and site issues. Each district also sets academic standards independently, including the placement exams used for entering students. The California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors in Sacramento govern the system, manage disbursal of funds, ensure that state mandates are met, and serve as a liaison among campuses.

Enrollment/Demographics

In spring 2006, about 37% of the student body was white, 29% Hispanic/Latino, 13% Asian/Pacific Islander, 7% African American, 3% Filipino, and 1% Native American/Alaskan Native. The rest were other ethnicities or unknown. According to a 2003 Campaign for College Opportunity report, more than 70% of California's Hispanic and African American students start their college experience at a community college. Income levels vary widely, but almost 80% of community college students work while attending school. Less than half of enrolled students come directly from high school.

STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

	Spring 2005	Spring 2006
Student Enrollment	1.60 million	1.60 million
24 Years and Younger	50%	50%

Data: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO)

TOTAL REVENUES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

A state formula determines how much funding community college districts receive. Student fees contribute less than 5% of the total budget. Thus if state funding decreases, enrollment is likely to be affected.

	2005–06		2006–07	
	(Millions)		(Millions)	
State	$3,700	46%	$4,300	48%
Local*	3,500	44%	3,900	44%
Federal	276	3%	279	3%
Student Fees+	355	4%	315	4%
Lottery	140	2%	178	2%
Total	**$7,971**		**$8,972**	

* Local includes local property taxes, the local portion of Proposition 98 Reversion Account, and other local funds.
\+ For California residents in 2006–07, fees were $26 per unit for the fall semester and $20 per unit for the spring semester.
Note: Due to rounding, the total may not add up to 100%.
Data: California Department of Finance (DOF)
Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO)

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

Index

	Card
Accountability Data	21, 24, 25, 27
Accountability: State	21, 25
ACT (College Admissions Test)	35
ADA (Average Daily Attendance)	12
Administrators in California	31
API (Academic Performance Index)	21
AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress)	24, 25
Basic Aid	12
Bonds	4, 5, 13
Budget Calendar	9
California English Language Development Test (CELDT)	28
California Standards Tests (CSTs)	26, 27
Categorical Aid, Funding	1, 2, 3
Charter Schools	15
Class Size Reduction	16
COLA (Cost-of-living Adjustment)	12
Collective Bargaining	32
College Eligibility	35
College Enrollments	36
Community Colleges	37
Data Collection and Reporting	17
Demographics, Student	30
Demographics, Teacher	34
Developer Fees	4, 13
Dropout Rates	23
Early Assessment Program (EAP)	26
English Language Development	28
English Learners (ELs)	28, 30
Enrollments, College	36
Enrollments, K–12	29
Equity (Funding)	12
Facilities	4, 13
Foundations and Contributions	13
Funding	1–8, 12, 13
Gann Limit	10
General Obligation Bonds	4, 5, 13
Governance of Public Schools	18
High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP)	25
High School Exit Exam	22
High School Graduation	23
Instructional Materials	19
Interventions (State)	25
Local Elections: General Obligation Bonds	5, 13
Local Elections: Parcel Taxes	6, 13
Local Sources of Revenue	13
Lottery	8
National Board Certification (Teacher)	33
National Data Sources	17
No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)	3, 24, 25, 28, 33, 34
Parcel Taxes	6, 13
PERB (Public Employment Relations Board)	32
Program Improvement (NCLB)	25
Property Taxes	8, 12, 37
Proposition 13 & Gann Limit	10
Proposition 98	8, 11
Pupil-Teacher Ratio	7
QEIA (Quality Education Investment Act)	25
Race/Ethnicity of Students	30
Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Teachers	34
Rankings for California	7
Revenue Limits	12
Revenues	8, 12, 13
SAT (College Admissions Test)	35
School District Income	12, 13
School Districts, General Information	29
School Finance Chronology	14
Serrano v. Priest	12, 14
Special Education	20, 22, 26, 30
Special Student Populations	20, 22, 26, 28, 30
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program	21, 26, 27
STAR Data	27
Student Demographics	30
Teacher Credential Requirements	33
Teacher Demographics	34
Teaching Assignments	34
Tests and Scores	21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28
UC/CSU Eligibility	35
Williams v. California	14, 19

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482
E-mail: edsource@edsource.org Website: www.edsource.org

520 San Antonio Road, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217
Tel: 650/917-9481 Fax: 650/917-9482 E-mail: edsource@edsource.org

Website: www.edsource.org